

Vol 7  
Comp  
✓  
**THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.**

NO. XXXIV.

44  
NEW SERIES—NO. IV.

SEPTEMBER, 1829.

- ART. I.—1. *An Oration delivered on the Fourth of July, 1829, in the City of Boston.* By JAMES T. AUSTIN. Boston. J. H. Eastburn. 1829. 8vo. pp. 26.  
2. *An Oration delivered before the Citizens of Nantucket, July 4, 1829.* By WILLIAM MORSE. Boston. Putnam & Hunt. 1829. 8vo. pp. 16.

SINCE the publication of our last number, the great political anniversary of the country has passed, and has been hailed with all those demonstrations of public rejoicing which the sage Adams so vividly foresaw, and so well described, at the very moment when he was putting his hand to the solemn instrument that declared us a free people. There is, in the affairs of men, a time to act, and there is a time to meditate. There is a time to conceive bold projects, and to execute them without fear or doubting; and there is an after time to consider their results, to guard the treasure which has been gained, to keep with diligence that which has been achieved with valor; a time to discriminate, to weigh, to watch, and to fear. Our revolution was a season of high resolve and undaunted actions. In the battle that summoned our fathers from their homes, no man's heart was to be shaken by doubts or foreboding; distrust and admonition had no place there; fear would have been cowardice. So men must act; they cannot be everything, or embrace everything at once. But now, the season of calm reflection and reasonable solicitude has come; now, fear is wisdom; now, the harder battle is to be fought, which demands

moderation, and temperance, and patience, and virtue that endures unto the end. Then, it was proper that freedom should be regarded chiefly as a blessing, that it should be worshipped as a divinity. Now, it is meet that we should look upon liberty as a trust; and if as a divinity, yet as a divinity like that Providence which dispenses all its best blessings on strict and severe conditions.

We have adverted to the late anniversary of our independence, and have placed at the head of this article some of the addresses which this occasion called forth, chiefly to give a direction to the thoughts of our readers. It is not our purpose to comment on this occasion, or on these addresses; nor will our remarks be confined to this country, though they are particularly designed to bear upon our duties as freemen, both in politics and religion. The cause of civil and religious liberty is the cause of human welfare. It binds itself with all our thoughts of the probable advancement of the human race in virtue and happiness. In this march of improvement our own country, indeed, may be considered as occupying the foremost place, and therefore deserves special notice as the great leading example. But the subject, in our apprehension, is limited to no one country. It embraces the best interests and hopes of all mankind. We look upon this world, indeed, as the field for a great moral experiment. A trial is passing upon its mighty theatre, and it is the trial of human souls. It is the conflict of knowledge with ignorance, of truth with error, of virtue with temptation, of piety with worldliness. The great end of the trial, so far as man is concerned, is to see whether he will work out his own welfare; whether, with moral faculties bestowed, with Providence teaching him, with Heaven's aid offered to assist him, he will become wise, good, and happy. This, to our view, is the grandest, the most comprehensive, the most momentous aspect of this world's history. And we confess, that when we look upon this history, when we look upon the crowded paths of past generations, and the struggling multitudes of men that have walked in them; when we survey the dark clouds that have hung over them,—that have gathered into thick darkness over fields of blood, over cities plunged into vice and licentiousness, over empires of despotism, over burning altars of superstition, and mournful regions of ignorance,—we confess that our hearts have sunk within us; and we have felt that it were meet for every reflecting man to say, in



the words of the holy lamentation, “Oh! that my head were waters, and my eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep for the slain”—for the broken and bowed down, for the sinful and miserable of my kindred and people!’ And, indeed, if we believed that this world were designed to finish the moral education of men; if it were anything more than, so to speak, the primary school for moral and immortal creatures; if there were no further scene of improvement, we should still feel that the great problem of moral probation, and the mystery of Providence, and the experiment on human welfare, had no solution.

In this great moral experiment, our own position as a nation, we repeat, is one of a most interesting character. It is a singular and unprecedented state of things on a *large* scale, that here is a people to whom the task is committed, without compulsion, without prescription, without any heritage of antiquated and superannuated laws, or institutions, or usages, freely to work out their own weal or wo; that here is a people, who are undertaking to think, to form opinions, and to act for themselves, on all subjects and matters touching their political, social, and religious welfare. This, at least, is the theory of our intellectual and moral condition; and it is going into effect far enough, at least, to justify a very deep and sober solicitude for the future. For let us say what we will about the just place which human interests occupy when deposited in the hands of the parties whose welfare is involved; let us repeat the maxims as often as we may, that ‘truth is powerful and will prevail,’ that ‘freedom is the richest boon of Heaven,’ ‘that knowledge is safe,’ that intellectual light is moral promise, still we maintain, that this experiment is not safe, and cannot come to a happy issue, without great care and exertion and fidelity on the part of those to whose hands it is committed. And we solemnly believe, that it is scarcely too much to say, that he who would be faithful to these times, and to this country, must be faithful to them with a zeal falling nothing behind that of apostles and martyrs. It is not they alone, who have poured out their blood upon their country’s altars of whom this fidelity was demanded; but it is equally demanded of those who are now fighting the battle with vice and ignorance, with superstition and intolerance, with headstrong passion and unscrupulous selfishness, and every foe to human welfare.

Liberty, we repeat, whether civil or religious, whether of

conscience or of action, whether for the mind or for the body, is *a trust*. This is our text; and we would that we had opportunity and power to preach a doctrine from it, that should reach to the highest, and penetrate to the lowest classes of society; that should cause itself to be felt from the loftiest seat of magistracy and the bench of justice, to the humblest exercise of suffrage and dispensation of equity between man and man; a doctrine, too, that should govern the most exalted minds in their moral reasonings, and the lowest minds in their too often untempered resistance to religious domination. This blessed boon of Heaven, like all its noble gifts, is a solemn charge, of whose fulfilment or neglect God will require an account, and man must feel the consequences. On this point everything turns; on the feeling, to make ourselves distinctly understood, and that feeling carried into practice, that *liberty is a trust*. We have heard its praises justly and eloquently expressed; we have heard its fruits and advantages set forth in glowing colors; we have heard much inflated language, indeed, on this favorite theme, but we have gone away, saying, 'All this is but a sound and a name, if the people, by a sober, and faithful use, do not make liberty to be that boon which it is so constantly represented to be.'

And what we are now saying, let us be permitted to add, goes beyond the ordinary admissions on this subject. It is common to admit, that 'the freedom of a nation depends upon its intelligence and virtue.' This is one of those vague and general maxims, that press upon everybody alike, and affects nobody in particular. It is not made a personal and private conviction and motive. It does not come home. It is like saying to children, 'You must be good children, for a great many good things are bestowed upon you, and if you are not good, all these things will be taken away;' very excellent sayings, conveying, indeed, a vague sense of responsibility, and an indistinct apprehension of coming evil, but not conveying the home-felt conviction, that happiness is put into every one's care and keeping. That, in truth, is the great office of freedom—to put every one's happiness into his care and keeping. And it addresses a strict and serious language to us. We do not think it enough to say to a family, 'Your welfare, your domestic happiness, depends on your intelligence and virtue;' we go into particulars. We say, 'It depends on such and such virtues. It depends on your fidelity and forbearance towards

one another, on your disinterested affection, and seeking of the common good.' And thus must we speak to the great political family. It is time that the morality, the *morale* of civil trusts, and of courts of justice, and of all political functions, in one word, that the duties of freemen, should be more thoroughly discussed among us; for these things are only regarded in the general.

And if our views go beyond the common admissions on this subject, we must say, also, that they go against the common and popular impressions. The prevailing, and almost the only idea of liberty, is, that it is a blessing. We shall endeavour, before we have done, to show in what respects it is indeed an invaluable good. For the present, we observe, that the idea of it as a blessing, is almost the only one that enters into the general estimate. It is this that constitutes the burden of so many of our anniversary orations, though we are glad to hear from this quarter a tone of greater sobriety and caution. It is this that is proclaimed when the 'trumpet to the cannon speaks, the cannon to the heavens.' It is this that rings out from the merry chime of bells that welcomes the anniversary morning. It is this that blazes forth from all the glare and splendor of our public celebrations. Now we are willing frankly to say, at whatever hazard of being thought to look coldly upon the cause of liberty, that we distrust the feeling that enters into these rejoicings. We are afraid that many look upon this boasted freedom as a liberty to do what they will, and not to do what they ought. The man who celebrates his freedom till he becomes licentious and noisy, and has lost the government of himself, can have little credit with us, for the value he puts upon this heavenly gift. Our very celebrations have doubtless too commonly shown, that, as a people, we have anything but a just estimate of our transcendent privileges.

But we now take up again the burden of our doctrine. Give freedom to any mind, and you put that mind to a severe trial of its character. Give freedom to any people, and you subject that people to a test, which no nation under heaven has ever been able to bear.

In the beautiful tales of Berquin, our readers will recollect the story of the children who would be their own masters. Freedom places man in the same condition. It makes them their own masters, and they must be no longer children, but men indeed, if they would safely bear the trial. We hold

that with many the case may fall out as it did with the unhappy children in the story, who pursued their own course till they quarrelled, and gorged their appetites with rich viands till they were sick, and plunged themselves into difficulties, which, but for timely interference, would have ended fatally.

We say this in religion. It is very possible that freedom of mind may be the means of injury to many, just as it is to the froward child too early released from parental control, or the flippant youth casting off the impressions of a religious education, only to rush into infidelity and atheism. It is a sincere and sound and honest mind only, that can be safely entrusted with perfect liberty. To think freely, to be free from all prejudices of every sort, it is a great trial to the strength and virtue of any mind. Take for illustration the case of your child. Suppose, that having been taught that reason and conscience should govern him, he should, with somewhat unusual precocity, seize upon this notion, and undertake to act upon these principles; that he should begin to question your authority as inferior to these laws. You would look upon that child as in great danger. You might hope much good, but you would fear much evil. So it is with men. Freedom of mind, imperfect freedom, such as might exist in the child,—for we are inclined to say that perfect freedom can belong only to a perfect mind, and would in fact be perfect safety,—freedom of mind, in the ordinary sense, we repeat, is a serious exposure. It is a trial, undoubtedly, from which the noblest form of character may arise; but still it is a trial. This, indeed, is the very theory and explanation of our moral condition in this world. It is a state of severe trial to all our virtues, in order that the noblest character may be produced by it. But it is clear that many fail; that what was designed to be the greatest good to them, becomes the greatest evil. And so it may be with freedom of mind in religion. It must injure bad men. It must injure those who desire to escape from all moral restraint. We do not say, that it were better for them to be slaves of superstition, or of error, or of authority. We believe that God made the mind to be free. We are willing that it should be in the state which was designed for it. We are willing that it should meet its trial, for we believe *that* is the will of God. But we would warn that mind of its danger; we would admonish it, that no intellectual freedom, no resistance to unlawful coercion, no railing at dogmatical authority, can make, much less show it, to be a good mind.



We say this in politics. We say it more indeed, of bodies politic, than we do of individual minds. We believe it is better that masses of men should not be placed under free constitutions, till they have the intelligence and virtue that promises success to the experiment. 'A grand concession,' the opposers of civil liberty, no doubt would say, if any concession from a quarter so humble, could be important. We will turn aside, then, a moment to consider it. For we would show, that if we see cause to admonish the advocates of liberty, we are much further from any sympathy with their opposers. We yield to them, therefore, all the benefit of our caution and anxiety on this subject, and yet we are at issue with them. We agree with them, that liberty has its dangers, and that many communities are unfit for it. But we deny, what in consistency they must maintain, we deny that human nature is necessarily so bad, or that it must continue so bad, that it cannot be trusted with freedom. We deny, that the very theory of a political condition, in which men shall make and amend their own institutions and laws, is fanciful and Utopian. We believe that there is a sufficient prevalence and promise of knowledge and moral habits in this country, to conduct the experiment to a happy issue. We believe that other countries are approaching to the same condition. Be it admitted that liberty is a dangerous thing to a people unprepared for it; but be it contended that the civilized world is advancing, though slowly, to the requisite state of morals and intelligence. And therefore are we still more at issue with those who are advocates for keeping the people in ignorance. They say, it is dangerous to the institutions of the Old World, that the people should be enlightened. Be it so. Then let those institutions be gradually changed, as the wants of the people demand and their intelligence can bear it. Let the shackles burst from the frame that is swelling with the inspiration of generous freedom. Our readers will recollect in this connexion, some remarkable admissions in the late *Quarterly Review*. From a quarter where concessions are stronger than any arguments, we rejoice to hear it admitted that the institutions of England must be modified to meet the exigences of the times and the spirit of the age. It has long seemed to us as clear as the sun in heaven, that England, in the course of a century, must undergo great changes in her institutions. Heaven grant that her rulers and her aristocracy may have wisdom to yield to the pressure

of growing knowledge and freedom of thought, without that strife and bloodshed which have formerly marked every step in her path to her present degree of liberty. In truth, it is time that England, and other governments in the Old World, were beginning to think of these things. If the light, the kindling warmth that is now pervading the masses of their population be on every side checked and repressed, it will ere long burst forth when no human bidding can restrain it. If it be yet more pent up, it may once again reveal itself in that 'earthquake voice,' which will spread astonishment and horror through the world.

But to return to our position ; we repeat, that the liberty of a people is a severe trial of its character, and one that no people has yet been able to bear. We need not dwell upon examples and instances. We need not say, that ancient times and modern times, that countries of the Old World and of the New World, unite to give this testimony and warning. We need not say, that the earth is tracked over with flaming beacons to show the perils of liberty ; that Judea, for the Jews were the freest people in the ancient world, and Greece and Rome and France and Spain, are names that bring admonition with them, and that Peru and Colombia and Mexico are now added to the portentous catalogue of facts and instances. We need not dwell upon these examples, not only because they are familiar by repetition, or near to us by local position, but because the lesson they enforce arises from the very genius and character of free institutions. What is it for a people to be free ? It is for every man to be a voter at elections, for every man in his turn to sit in judgment on the rights and property of his fellow citizens, for every man to be eligible to office, and the highest office ; for every man to have a voice in making or amending the laws, for every man, in short, to do his pleasure in as many ways as the common good will permit. Despotism, hereditary trusts, fixed institutions, are all removed in a free state, to make way for the single element of individual responsibility. It must be a great responsibility, for everything depends upon it, the whole fabric of government rests upon it. It is universal ; it presses upon every man. It is a moral responsibility ; it demands fidelity, it exacts obedience. Men must be virtuous, disinterested, sober, watchful, wise, to a certain extent, or they cannot be free ; that is to say, they cannot preserve any rational freedom. This condi-

tion of society implies in its members, a mutual respect for each other's rights and interests. And such a charge can be safely sustained only by reasonable and considerate men. To commit free institutions to the rude, the reckless, and violent, is to commit a fabric of frail and loose materials to the wild and tumultuous waves of the ocean. The responsibility implied in this state of things, we must add, is peculiar ; it is greater than is involved in any other political condition. A despotism may stand, and has often stood, for ages, without either virtue or intelligence to support it. It stands in prescription ; it stands in the fear of the people. It is strengthened by the very ignorance of the people. But it cannot be so with a republic. Take an illustration on a small scale. So long as the slaves on a plantation are under the absolute rule of a master, they are quiet and safe ; their motions are regular as those of machinery, and their individual responsibility amounts to almost nothing. But form them into a free community, and into what danger do you throw them, and what consequence is attached to the conduct of every individual ! So it is with the citizens of a free state. Freedom can only keep pace with improvement. It implies in its possessors self-control. It is a trust, and nothing but fidelity can discharge it. Let the passions of men be like untamed wild animals, and it is better that they should be fenced in and fettered by prescription, and guarded in cages, than be suffered to go loose. It is better for the men themselves during the passing generation, though free and more violent action might in the long course of things work out higher results.

We have been laboring to show that liberty is a trust, and a dangerous trust. To the same purpose we now offer another remark ; which is, that the institutions of a free state, are altogether of the nature of a defence against the passions of men, and are constructed upon the very supposition that those passions are dangerous.

Let us look, then, at some parts of the machinery of a free government ; and since it is so constantly and exclusively a theme of boasting, let us consider the nature of the defence with which it provides us. It ought not to be said of freemen that they cannot count the cost, and weigh, against all objections, the worth of their privileges.

The truth is that free institutions are nothing but burdensome and expensive provisions against the selfish and violent

passions of men. The system of representation is an instance of this. Ten men, the best and wisest that could be found, and chosen for life, could more skilfully, more discreetly and calmly legislate for us, than one or two hundred chosen annually, and therefore inexperienced ; chosen at hazard from the people, and therefore less qualified ; or chosen under high party excitement, and therefore comparatively disqualified. And who, indeed, had not rather refer to one man, distinguished for his knowledge, wisdom, and virtue, the decision of some difficult state question, than to commit it to a popular assembly ? But here is the difficulty, we cannot trust one man or ten men, with such a responsibility at all ; much less permanently. There is more danger of ambition, more exposure to bribery, to corrupt influence, more liability to act on partial and selfish views, among a few. We fear that unless the interests of all are represented in form, the interests of all will not be taken into the account in fact. Hence the land must be often agitated and embroiled with contested elections ; prejudices and jealousies must be stirred up between neighbours and friends ; time must be expended, and after all, property must be taxed, to pay the expense of our costly privileges. This is freedom, and we value it ; but we see reason to put a sober estimate upon it. It is not exempt from that law which has passed upon every outward blessing of life ; to wit, that it must be procured at an expense proportioned to its value.

Look again at the structure of a free government in itself considered. What are checks and balances, as they are called, in its political organization, but checks upon the passions and caprices of men, and balances of their selfish interests ? We must have an unwieldy organization of three branches in the government, and a law cannot pass, till it has gone round to them all and secured their concurrence ; and all this lest one branch should have an interest to do what it ought not to do, and what may be prevented by the others.

Once more ; our boasted trial by jury is liable to the same exceptions. It is a security, in some cases an indispensable one, but still a clumsy and costly security. The practice, which prevails on the continent of Europe, of trial by judges alone, gives a far more speedy, and, in many cases, a far more correct decision. It must unavoidably happen, that twelve men, drawn by lot from the mass of the people, are incompetent to analyze and resolve many of the complicated cases of



law that come before them ; and after all, they ordinarily rely on the charge of the judge. Here, then, are twelve men, taken from their families and their business, and brought together to attend the examination of witnesses, to hear arguments, to be tried often with ingenuity and sophistry, to be wearied with discussion, and after all to do what in most cases would be better done, more intelligently and accurately, and more directly done, without them. Lawsuits are protracted, the evil passions of litigation are confirmed, expenses accumulated, till patience and property are both exhausted ; and all through the very imperfection, the clumsiness, if we may speak so, of this boasted provision for trial by jury. What purpose then does it serve ? A very important purpose without doubt, and one that is sufficient to vindicate all the trouble it gives us. It serves, as far as anything can, to prevent the possibility of corruption. An independent jury stands between the citizen and the possible oppression of the government. Whoever is brought to the bar of his country on the charge of having violated its laws, instead of being in the power of his superiors, who might have their reasons for wishing to crush him, may commit himself to the impartial and disinterested justice of a jury of his fellow citizens and equals.

Free institutions, we repeat, are predicated upon the very supposition that there is danger. They are barriers, and they are not impregnable barriers ; they can offer resistance only to a certain extent. They are battlements, and their security and defence must depend very much on those who man them. In short, everything depends on fidelity to the great trust.

This fidelity we now urge by one further and final consideration.

We may appear to some to have disparaged the worth of civil and religious freedom. We would not be thought, however, to undervalue it. We certainly go along, quite as far as our reflection will justify, with the common estimate of it. To enjoy the greatest freedom is certainly one of the greatest of blessings. To be 'lords of ourselves, though not of lands,' to be free, though poor, though depressed, though destitute of almost everything else, seems nearly a compensation for the want of everything besides. To do, and say, and write almost what we please, to go where we will, to breathe the free air, and tread the free earth, with no bitter exaction or lowering frown of a tyrant to curse the soil or to darken the sky ; to

have no self-constituted or titled masters or nobles, before whom to bow; to be compelled, in other words, to pay no homage but to well earned distinction, to stand amidst those whom God and nature have made no better and no worse than ourselves, free and equal,—this seems to us a manifest and great good, a signal and blessed fortune, a lot salutary and favorable to all our highest powers, our best sentiments, and the most excellent virtues. But after all we suspect that our pride, our resistance to just rule, to the just control of wisdom and moderation, may enter into our appreciation of this blessing. We would take a more strict and sober account of it. We conceive, indeed, and this is the consideration we were about to bring forward, that liberty in fact is in its very nature a blessing that implies the most dangerous of trusts; that it imperatively calls upon us to be thoughtful and serious and wise; that its very greatness should fill us with caution and self-distrust; that its very glory, like that of reason and a moral nature, may be turned only to more exceeding shame and ruin.

We would not awaken unreasonable distrust of this gift, but seriousness and fidelity in the use of it. We feel, indeed, if the remark will not bring our modesty into question, that we touch a great theme, and one of wide relations; and we would say nothing rashly. Free action of mind and of communities, manifesting itself through the press and popular elections, free action of every man's wit and wisdom and invention for the individual and the common weal, is the great feature of the age. We look with unspeakable solicitude to the event. We feel as if this poor world, stricken, for ages stricken with its own follies and crimes, were taking its great chance; and we would, therefore, that men in this country, and in every country, might think and speak and act soberly, as conscious of the weighty trust and the coming issue.

Let us say, then, with all due consideration, that freedom is in its very nature, a comparative, a conditional, and we must add, an unstable good. It is comparative. It is better than despotism, but it is only better; it is not an absolute and certain benefit to any people. It is conditional. It is not so distinctly and independently a blessing as the gifts of nature or the faculties of mind. It is only a permission, under the fewest possible restrictions compatible with the general good, to use the gifts of nature and the faculties of our minds, according to our own pleasure. The benefit, therefore, does not

exist, till our own wisdom and virtue give it being. It is anarchy and misrule, without these. Liberty is not so much an advantage, as it is an opportunity. It does not so far naturally or necessarily benefit any being, as his own reason, or the bounties of life; and yet these are far from possessing any absolute power to bless him. And, we must say, also, that it is an unstable good. Liberty is not a fixture. It is not an establishment. It is not a government. That is but the form of liberty; the spirit, the essence is in the minds of the people. The forms of a republican government may be made as oppressive as a despotism. Liberty abides in nothing, and has security in nothing, but the spirit of the people. We greatly mistake, it is apprehended, and yet we are afraid that as a nation we do thus mistake, when we suppose that there is anything in the structure of our government, that can save us from following in that gloomy train of examples that has darkened all the paths of history. It is not the government that can sustain the people; but it is the people that must sustain the government. It is not the Constitution that will preserve our character; but it is our character that must preserve the Constitution. It is not the political creed of the country that can uphold its faith and faithfulness; but the faith, the faithfulness of the people it is, that must uphold the creed.

Again we say, let us not be misunderstood. Freedom, in every form, of every kind, is a transcendent privilege. Freedom of mind is a glorious gift. It is a blessing beyond all price, and beyond all power of language to express. We are ready to say that no man can surpass us, and that no man can instruct us, in the unutterable sense of its value. It is a good which nothing can transcend but the use of it. That dominion in the mind, that holy retreat from violence, oppression, and wrong; that place in the soul where freedom is, with its wide and boundless range of uncontrolled thoughts, with no power to govern in it but truth and right, with no presence to be worshipped but the presence of the Divinity,—it is the chosen dwelling-place of our most precious thoughts. But then, it is a ‘holy place,’ and to be entered with trembling. It is like the flaming Mount of old, glorious indeed, but sending out awful voices to warn the rash intruder. It is dangerous, because it is glorious. Freedom of mind, like every exalted trust, like lofty intellect, immense wealth, and vast dominion, should inspire a solicitude, care, and fidelity, proportionate to the mag-

nitude of the trust. And so it is with the freedom of a people. Our sympathies are with it; they are with it far abroad in every land where its air is breathed, and its soil is moistened with the dews of heaven. We go along, in our enthusiasm, with those who have labored and suffered in its holy cause. Our hearts are with them, when they put on buckler and sword as its last defence. Our hearts are with them, when in the 'red field' they seal their devotion to it, in sacrifices of blood. But God forbid that what is so dearly bought, should be negligently kept. Let it be no matter of idle boast or vain parade. Let it not be celebrated with a merely childish and boisterous exultation. Those who have fought, should ponder. We cannot go along with panegyric and shout and holiday felicitations, without any consideration or sobriety. It does not become the dignity and manliness of free citizens, to look with idle admiration upon their institutions, as children do upon the show and glitter of a military parade, never considering the anarchy and distress to which it may easily be turned. These are 'childish things,' which it becomes a wise people to 'put away.' A free people must reflect, must understand their privileges, and must solemnly and virtuously resolve to preserve them, or in that fearful poise between good and evil where liberty places them, they will inevitably fall into evil, disorder, and destruction.

We have endeavoured in the observations which we have laid before our readers, to 'speak as to wise men.' And now do we beseech all men to be faithful to that great trust, which, as we have endeavoured to show, is implied in the possession of civil and religious liberty. It is a holy bequest from the faith and fortitude of elder times, sanctified by the prayers and tears and blood of our fathers. Millions in past ages have sighed for a draught from that fountain which is freely opened to us. Let not its waters be poisoned; let them not be wasted.

We would lay solemn charge upon the conscience of every voter at our elections. Let him remember that he is performing the first duty of a freeman, and that God and his country demand an honest and an unprejudiced suffrage. Let him remember that if he is governed by selfish interest and passion, if he gives up his individual judgment and conscience to a party, if he listens to the bribery of any personal fear or hope, he is forsworn and perjured at the very altar of Liberty. He



has sold his very birthright, and he ought to be the slave in form, that he makes himself in reality, and some other man, of nobler and freer soul, albeit compelled to bow before the throne of a despot, deserves his privilege.

We appeal to the ministers of justice in our courts, to jurors and witnesses and advocates. Morality, as applicable to judicial transactions, is a subject that ought to be much more considered than it has been. Equal justice, we know, often arises from opposing considerations, from the conflict of men's thoughts. Let this conflict, then, be carried on, but let it be done honestly and fairly. There is no new code of morals for a man, because he is prosecuting or pleading a cause, or giving testimony before a public tribunal. No; the same law of God extends to all places, and it is only, if possible, more strict there than elsewhere. Wrong is worse there, because it puts on the form of right, and is done with deliberation. Anger and revenge have not the apology of haste; nor deceptive representations, of inadvertence; and falsehood, there, is perjury, and the perversion of justice is a breach of trust.

We would address ourselves, if our words could reach them, to men who are high in office. The inquiry often presses itself on our minds, and with unfeigned solicitude, whether the distinguished men in this country are looking with a sober sense of their duty and a deep feeling of their responsibility, to the great experiment, to which they are contributing so much to bring to a happy or a fatal issue. There may be those among them to whom all talk about their duties would pass for nothing better than cant. May God deliver this country from many such! If there ever were men to whom duty should be a serious word, who should tremble at their responsibility to God and men, they are the leading statesmen, orators, and teachers, whether religious or political, of this nation. If we could address them, we would say, 'No men ever enjoyed such an opportunity as is given to you, for accomplishing the best hopes of patriotism and philanthropy. Solon, Aristides, Demosthenes, the Fabii, Cato, and Cicero, had no such materials to work with as you have in the intelligence and virtue of this free people. To all human view, the last great experiment of republican freedom that is likely to be tried for ages, is passing under your guidance. The eyes of the world are upon you. Ages that have passed in the noble strife for liberty, ages of patriot tears and blood, call upon you, and unborn

generations echo the call to you, to be faithful to the solemn trust. For God's sake, and for your country's, let us say, let us intreat you, hear the call. The happiness of one family is a sacred charge. What then must be the happiness of millions through unknown periods! With these multitudes, it is not too serious to say, you must yet bow low before the seat of Almighty Justice. And then, when the dazzling world, with all its splendid honors, has passed away, one word of benediction from that throne of eternal truth and honor, shall be more than all the wreaths, the titles, the offices, the distinctions, that the world can heap upon you.'

But our main dependence, after all, is upon the whole body of the people; and to them, in the ultimate resort, do we direct our eyes for hope and safety. They can raise up or pluck down. Although they cannot give great talents or take them away, they can do much to elicit or to check them, to make them useful or injurious. And, indeed, this is one of the most material considerations that can be addressed to our communities. How much of the purest intelligence that adorns our country, how much of the truest wisdom, virtue, and moderation, how much real talent of the more delicate stamp, may be driven by party violence, abuse, and calumny, from the field of political usefulness, is a serious question. If a man distinguished in office, be selfish and corrupt, let him be reprobated. But if there be 'good men and true' in such situations, let us be true to them; let us remember their services and toils; let us give them an honor which no fluctuations of party can shake; let us think of them, not with indifference as a part of the machinery of government, nor with envy as exalted, but with gratitude, with confidence, and, we deem it not too serious to say, with prayers for them.

In every view, indeed, that we can take of liberty and its institutions, we shall find that they press down upon the mass of the people as an individual trust; and if freedom be anything valuable, it must be by becoming an individual good. Liberty ordains no lofty titles, and builds no magnificent palaces for the exclusive possession of the few. It is a blessing for all, or it is no blessing. Its sole advantage consists in its permitting all to pursue their own good, their own happiness; and if they do not pursue it, of what avail is the boasted gift? It is quite enough our boast; let it be more our blessing. If it is only a boast, it will cease in any valuable sense to exist. We are free

from political oppression ; and yet it may be that we are in bondage to the fear or hatred or envy of one another, in bondage to ambition, to revenge, or to avarice. We live in a land of freedom ; but how many are slaves to sensuality, slaves to wicked companions, slaves to negligently accumulated debt. Here are no walls, indeed, raised by tyranny to hide its victims from the day, no prison vaults to be the graves of the living, no dungeons, from which the cry of suffering innocence can never be heard. But vice has its victims, who are shut out from the light of day, from the respect of society ; vice has its lone dungeons, in which not the innocent are chained down, but in which innocence itself is lost ; its grave for the living, for whom it were better if they were dead.

And if these things go on, and proceed from one step to another, from bad maxims to worse indulgences, then will that liberty, which, to such, exists only in form and is no longer a blessing,—then will it be to the country no longer a blessing, and ere long, it will cease to exist even in form. Let the tide of luxury and immorality rise higher and higher, let the barriers of public virtue be broken down, let the good old disinterestedness, and the generous patriotism of our fathers, give way to universal selfishness, political corruption, and base office-seeking ; let mighty parties arise, which are grounded on no other principle than the love of office, or let parties arise and grow upon sectional disputes and jealousies, and this very generation may not pass away till all these things which we fear, are accomplished ; yes, we who read these things with whatever indifference or incredulity, may find that the language of warning was the language of prophecy, that the language of warning has become the language of history.

We do not expect that the possibility of this catastrophe will now be regarded with any serious apprehension. And yet we do none the less fear because of this security, but the more. No people, in calm times and a settled order of things, ever looked for their downfall. Immorality gains slowly and imperceptibly upon a people. The signs of the coming tempest steal silently over the heavens. The change passes so gradually that men do not see it. So it has been with every people ; and when the catastrophe has come, it has come in flood and storm and thunder.

We hear much of the *spirit of this age* ; but it seems more an object to dwell with exultation on the tendencies of the

public mind at this day, than to point out the *duties of the age*. We believe, indeed, that the present epoch promises more than any former period in the long continued experiment upon human nature, because Christianity is in the field, more free and unfettered than it ever was before ; because knowledge is in the field ; because ' the schoolmaster,' as has been said with a pertinence and emphasis that have converted the saying into a proverb, because ' the schoolmaster is abroad,' upon the field of this great trial ; and if men can become free, wise, and religious, it may be hoped that they will become so now.

But to conduct this experiment to a successful issue, will require exertions—yes, and qualities, on the part of its friends, which they can never too highly appreciate. And we cannot leave the subject without offering two or three remarks, in a broad view, to all who have the real improvement of the world at heart, on what we think ought to be the spirit of these times.

A wakeful heed and foresight are first of all demanded of the age ; a consciousness of the part which this generation has to act, a solemn impression of our duties to future times. This should be no theme merely for fancy to embellish, or for rhetoric to adorn. It should be a great and impressive conviction. The men who are to take part in the work of bringing this momentous trial to a happy result, and every man may do something, must feel that patriots, prophets, and confessors had never a greater. They must not sleep upon their post. They must be awake and on the alert, and watch the signs of the times. This is no affair of political management, of commercial monopoly, of relief to the manufacturing interests, of internal improvements, of national administration, save as all these bear upon the great end. These are ' signs of the sky and the earth ' in comparison. No ; but the great question is, whether the people of this country, and of England and of France and Germany and Russia, shall be wiser, more virtuous, religious, and happy races of men, fifty years hence, than they now are. It is not whether general wealth and luxury shall advance ; they will advance,—but whether governments shall become more just, mild, and paternal, whether schools and universities shall be more effective instruments for training the mind ; whether cities shall be purified from their iniquities and vices, and families shall be well ordered, virtuous, pious, and happy ; whether churches shall become purer, and knowledge shall increase, and righteousness shall exalt the nations. And to this



question, we repeat, all men and minds, and books written at this day, and journals and associations and communities, should be awake.

In the next place, we would entreat all the advocates of this cause, to be sober; to think and speak and write and act with perfect sobriety. We want no Utopian schemes in aid of this cause. All visionary theories, fanciful speculations about perfectibility, extravagant measures, violent innovations, propositions without evidence, and proposals without reasonableness, and zeal without knowledge, and faith without works, must retire from this cause and let it alone. This, at least, must be the theory of the age; and we must come as near it as possible. In truth we want sober men. And we would that men would use all their trusts and privileges with more sobriety; that they would enter into school committees, political offices, and the learned professions, and into all the courses of trade and business, with a more thoughtful consideration of the part they are acting in relation to the moral welfare of mankind. We could easily show that the very transaction of business is a weighty trust in this respect; and that at this very moment, the eagerness for gain, hazardous speculation, pecuniary embarrassment—yes, that debt all over this country, threatens more moral evil to the next generation, than any other cause that can be named. The men of business as well as men of study, actors as well as authors, on this present stage, men with families, with children looking to them for education, with trusts of every nature, must be sober; must be sober, as feeling that the next age will depend upon what they think, and do, and are.

We do not know what is to be the state of things in this land and in Christendom fifty years hence; but we know that if men go on heedlessly, if all pursue their own immediate and selfish ends, without regard to the general good and the coming result, if none take thought for the signs of the times, that the experiment will be involved in infinite peril. We know that if political elections, and judicial proceedings, and the principles of trade, become thoroughly selfish and corrupt, if good institutions decline, if the sabbath is trodden under foot, and public worship is neglected, and there is no concert or cooperation for good and holy ends—we know that the hope, we had almost said, the last hope of the world, will be whelmed in ‘the tide of human passions, competitions, and vices.’

Once more, we urge as becoming this age, a spirit of mingled firmness and forbearance; firmness, we say, to go on in the work of general improvement, without fear or faltering; to meet difficulty and opposition, to go through evil report and good report, looking for a support and a reward beyond this world; but yet more we say, of forbearance, for this will be the virtue more needed, or at least more tried. Our thoughts in this connexion are naturally led to religious difficulties, as those which more immediately press upon ourselves.

It is true, indeed, that all classes and sects of good men, are, more or less directly, helping on this cause; and it is unfortunate that they cannot see it. We do not know of a religious sect, for instance, in this country, which is not, in our apprehension, doing and intending to do great good. But they do not accredit the motives of each other to this extent; they fall out by the way, and therefore they have great need of forbearance.

This great cause, it seems, must go on with a controversy. And in this mighty march of improvement, the liberal party in this country and in England, occupy, what our adversaries to be sure will not allow to be any place at all, but what, taking only an equal liberty, we must be allowed to say, is the place of the vanguard. And occupying this place, they are liable to be wounded by the very arrows which are launched out against the common enemy. On this little band, therefore, is it necessary to urge, more than upon all others, the duty of firm and patient forbearance. On them, then, be it enjoined, to set before the world a new example of the spirit of controversy that becomes Christians. We trust that they are coming to it. We trust that we discern a good spirit arising among them. Publications, in which their adversaries can see nothing but weak and impolitic confessions, signs of disbanding and of retiring from the controversy, we regard as evidences that the noble spirit of freedom, of truth and love, is triumphing over the spirit of party and angry controversy and strife. Let them go on. We think they have done well; let them do better. Let them take example from a Hindoo Reformer, who disputes with a candor and meekness that does not take offence, and cannot understand it. Let us forsake the sad and stale resorts of old controversy, and show the zeal of the first Reformation, without its bitterness. In truth, Luther and his

coadjutors and opposers, must not be our examples. Let that zeal for truth and for the world's good possess us, which knows not anger, and cannot be narrowed down to petty disputes.

It is better, we were ready to say, to defend a bad cause with a good spirit, than to defend a good cause with a bad spirit. But what do we say? The good spirit is the good cause. If, in the conflicts of the times, we become truly liberal-minded and generous; if we become humble, and meek, and patient; if with every controversy we draw nearer and nearer to the God of love, to the spirit of all grace and peace; then, then indeed do we triumph; then do we gain the best of conquests, a victory over ourselves. God evermore grant us such victories!

---

ART. II.—*Life of Archbishop Cranmer.* By J. A. SARGANT.  
London. Hurst, Chance, & Co. 1829. 12mo. pp. 288.

THE powerful minds now employed upon the English history, with one exception, have hardly the grace to pretend to impartiality. Their whole object is, to point out the history of their own party through the faint registry of ages past; to find the traces of party principles, or precedents for party measures, without caring how much history is perverted from its great purpose of moral instruction. This profound sympathy with the events and characters of a thousand years ago, is a curious feature of the English character. The friends of constitutional freedom, are enraptured with every vestige they can discover in history, of resistance to arbitrary power; and their adversaries can see no merit in those who ever wished to limit the prerogative. Thus the accumulated passions of ages are brought to bear on almost every public question. The Catholic question, for example, was lately debated by one party, as if Rome was in the fulness of its power, and no change had taken place in the last two hundred years. They considered it an act of supernatural courage to move the rotten bar, while to other nations it seemed like the decision of an abstract proposition, a mere acknowledgment of a truth which time had settled long ago; and the prime minister, like one who unbars

the windows at noon, to let in the light that had long been shining on the rest of the world.

We are glad that the triumph of the historians of freedom is likely to be so complete, and that Hume, though he cannot be put down till a rival appears, is likely to be balanced by authorities powerful and high; but we are not blind to the fact that these new historical stars are acted upon by the disturbing force of party feeling. With all our love of liberty, we cannot join them in their celebrations of English freedom, in the times of the ancient sovereigns; those of Henry VIII., for instance, when parliaments were employed in registering the adulteries and murders of that low minded ruffian; or those of Elizabeth, when old Peter Wentworth could not lift up his solitary voice, without a visit to the Star Chamber and the Tower; and when the indifference with which the monarch listened to any bold complaint, showed how firm were the foundations on which her authority stood. Nor is their judgment of character to pass unchallenged. We believe with them, that Charles I. was insincere, and the cause of the parliament was just; but we do not believe that they were any more scrupulous than their royal master. We believe that Cromwell, compared with some other usurpers, was manly and honorable; but we do not look upon his accession as a triumph of freedom, nor do we consider him a meek and holy man forced into absolute power. We believe that the dealing of Charles II. with France, was a base transaction; but we are not disposed to excuse Sidney for the same corruption, by saying that it was the fashion of the day. There is no doubt in our minds that James II. intended to overthrow the liberty of his people; but this does not clear the 'glorious and immortal memory' of William from the stain of Glencoe. We do not consider the good cause of freedom as casting an inviolable glory, on all, who, for various reasons, supported it, nor are we willing to charge that sacred cause with the errors and crimes of its defenders. We consider the liberty of the people as making part of the great reformation which was then beginning in the world. The invention of printing enabled them to read their rights and duties; the compass enabled science to spread the light from nation to nation, and it was but a natural result, that the corruptions in science, government, and religion, should be thrown open to the day, and attempts be made to reform them.



We say this because the Reformation makes part of the civil history of Great Britain ; and all our histories of that event are more or less obscured by party feelings and passions. On the continent, a great reformation in religion was going on. Men were setting themselves free from the restraints of old oppression. The human mind was rising, and lifting off the burden which had rested upon it for ages. There were men of noble resolution, like Luther and his coadjutors, to take the lead in the conflict ; and considering the vast interests engaged on both sides, and the sternness of spirit which such times require, there is not much in the conduct of the Reformers to dishonor that great victory of the human mind. But the Reformation in England was conducted in a different spirit, and by less worthy hands. Undoubtedly the way for it was prepared by the growing light of the world ; but it was immediately the result of vulgar passion. There is no name, excepting that of Wickliffe, a century before, entitled to unqualified praise. He was indeed a great and self-sacrificing reformer ; but, had he lived in what is called the English Reformation, he would certainly have received the honors of martyrdom from the hands of Henry. This event, inglorious as it was, resulted no doubt in good ; but it was only as the wrath of man is always made to work out the great purposes of God.

We can better understand the character of the agents in the transaction, if we consider what changes actually took place at the time of the English Reformation. The most direct effect was to destroy the religious establishments. It is commonly understood, that all their aisles and cloisters were floating with corruption ; but we are inclined to believe that their corruption was as much overrated as their treasures, and who doubts, that, but for those treasures, they might have stood in all their iniquity till time had eaten their walls to the foundation ? We do not suppose that they were nurseries of virtue or devotion ; but we believe that the morality of monasteries was at least as good as that of courts and camps in that day. They were, too, a useful restraint on the violence of the military. They were retreats, where the little learning there was in those times, found a home. They were a refuge for the defenceless, their gates were seldom shut against the wayfaring or the poor, and bad as they were, they were better than the military barbarism to which they set bounds. The avarice of the king was encouraged to confiscate their treasures, by the

hope of the people to relieve themselves from future exactions. But, unless the time had come for the scriptures to circulate among the people by means of the newly invented press, unless the minds of men had been prepared for more enlightened representations of religion, we believe their destruction would have been an evil rather than a blessing. For religion, even in that form, carried some consoling and reviving influences with it; perverted as it was, it was better than none at all.

But what was the reformation in religious faith? Was the power of the Pope disowned and dishonored? So far from asserting that his authority was contrary to reason and scripture, it was not resisted till the Pope, after the dictate of common sense and scripture, refused to annul the marriage of Henry with his injured queen. And then, by way of preventing future abuses, the royal reformer transferred the whole authority of Rome to his own person, and Sir Thomas More's, the best head in England, fell on the scaffold for opposing this usurpation. The opinions of the old religion remained for a long time unchanged. The doctrine of the real presence, of all the Catholic tenets the most absurd and revolting, was the last to be abandoned. But we need say the less on this point, since many of the Catholic opinions, among others the 'doctrines of grace,' whose sweet influences we are not unacquainted with in New England, retain much of their power at the present day. The truth seems to have been, that the king's oppressive acts against the Catholics, evidently dictated by avarice and passion, and supported for similar reasons by his courtiers, created a natural prejudice in favor of the weaker party in more intelligent minds, and made them adhere to opinions, which, could they have examined them impartially, they would have been foremost to cast away.

But was there any change for the better in free inquiry? Free inquiry became more common, because the minds of men were gaining light and strength. But, though the change was effected without disturbance, toleration was no better understood than before. There was even less freedom than in the time of Wickliffe. The moment the Protestants gained the upper hand, they became the oppressors; and the whole power of the state, like a ship taken from a hostile fleet, with its name and colors changed and its guns turned on its former owners, was sent into the strife again. Crowns of martyrdom were distributed with princely liberality by

‘England’s merry king.’ His gentle soul was overpersuaded by hoary counsellors, to lengthen the red list of murder, and the faithful chronicler, Stow, gives us the names of those who perished in the reign of the virgin queen. We do not complain that the English glory, in what seems to us to bear strong resemblance to their shame, the time when lords and commons, master and slave, submitted to the childish weakness or savage passion of a woman. But when they pour out unsparing condemnation on the intolerant cruelty of Mary, and praise Elizabeth to the skies, we feel bound to say that blood flowed almost as fast in one reign as the other, and that while it does not appear as if Elizabeth really believed the faith for which she persecuted, Mary had at least the excuse of a horrible sincerity in her crimes. We know that heretics suffered in the time of Elizabeth, not as heretics, but as enemies to the state ; a fact, which, properly explained to them, must have afforded much comfort in their dying hours, but cannot remove the reproach from the power which condemned them to die.

The English Reformation, then, was not the glorious event it is sometimes represented. Nor was it a distinguished part of that real reformation, which was then taking place in the world ; which could not fail to take place when the treasures of ancient learning were drawn out from their caverns, when commerce enlarged the acquaintance of men with each other, and the press began to put the scriptures into every man’s hand. Neither were there at that day any in England, who, like Erasmus, materially aided in producing these changes ; at least in such a disinterested manner as to entitle them to the gratitude of future times. The cause of human improvement would have gone on without them ; nor are we fond of attributing much to the exertions of any individuals, for to us it seems that the high spirit of Luther only hastened an event for which deep and powerful causes had been preparing. The Roman authority was sinking beneath its double weight of splendor and corruption. The multitude were beginning to learn the secret of their strength, and the world must have risen in its might when the fulness of time was come. It seems matter of regret, that force should have been resorted to ; for hence it is that, in putting down spiritual dominion, a military spell, equally inconsistent with Christianity, is left in all its power, and now seems to demand a second reformation, almost as great and thorough as the first.

We have made these remarks in reference to the book before us. It is, as may be supposed, a flattering view of the great apostle of the English Reformation. It is not entitled to notice as a work of talent. There is no attempt at discrimination in drawing the character of Cranmer. The writer's whole object is to recommend him as a great and irreproachable example. Now it is precisely in this character that he is least to be recommended. He was a man of ability, and in many respects attractive and amiable in his character. But the great name of reformer, implies a forgetfulness of self, a manly courage, a generous self-devotion to the interests of his race, a moral sensibility quick and delicate, and a principle of duty stern and high; in all which, Cranmer, weighed in the balances, was found wanting. True, he was the leader of the English Reformation. But if our views of that event be correct, it was a political revolution, hardly coincident in time, assuredly not in character, with the great reformation in learning and religion which was then opening the eyes of the world.

Cranmer makes his first appearance on the stage, at the time when Henry VIII., after having been twenty years married to his brother's widow, begins to have doubts respecting the legality of such a marriage; doubts not a little encouraged, and, we have no doubt, first suggested, by a passion for another. Public opinion has long ago given its impartial verdict on this point; and, till we read this writer, we supposed there could be no question of the open baseness of the whole transaction. Shakspeare, with all his desire to conciliate Elizabeth, finds nature and truth too strong for him; and, as Johnson remarks, the interest of the play comes and departs with the injured queen.

While Henry is still in suspense, on account of the Pope's refusal, for good or bad reasons, to give his sanction to the divorce, he is relieved from his perplexity by Cranmer. The object, of course, was not to satisfy himself, but to offer some decent excuse to the world, and the plan suggested by the reformer was no mean proof of his worldly wisdom. He proposed to submit the naked question to the universities of Europe, whether a man might lawfully marry his deceased brother's wife, which he knew well enough was not the question at issue. The real question was, whether, on account of a new and unlawful passion, a faithful wife should be infamously discarded after a union of twenty years. The former he knew



they would decide according to the Levitical law, without regard to common sense or feeling. But we believe no university in existence, out of England, would have rendered judgment in the king's favor, with the circumstances before them. The manner in which he was obliged to proceed, so unlike his usual violence, is proof enough that the feeling of that age was the same with ours; the feeling of nature, which councils and churches cannot alter, nor tyrants quite suppress.

The author of this *Life*, undertakes to justify the part taken by Cranmer on this occasion, and actually talks himself into the conviction, that his conduct was not only justifiable but praiseworthy. He even thinks that the king's doubts were sincere, and at any rate, that it was not for Cranmer to question his sovereign's word. We will not insult our readers by answering these sage reasonings, for on this subject there can be but one opinion. When the counsellor is rewarded with the mitre of Canterbury, no one doubts that it was gained with some expense of conscience and character, and was dearly, if not honorably earned. But if it were not so, he had an opportunity of redeeming himself from the reproach a short time after, when the king was married to Anne Boleyn, in January, though the sentence of divorce from Catharine, was not pronounced till May. Here he might have acted the part of Nathan to David. Here, the man mighty in the scriptures, might at least have said, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery,' or he might have retired from a court so profligate and dishonored. But we cannot learn that a whisper of disapprobation, from first to last, proceeded from the archiepiscopal throne, while the streets of London rung with condemnation. It is commonly believed, on Lord Herbert's authority, that Cranmer was present at the ceremony; and his biographer admits it, without seeming to perceive how disgraceful such attendance would have been. But among Mr Ellis's original letters, we find one from the Archbishop himself, in which he positively denies it, and no one can doubt, with truth; for sometimes a wound upon the conscience is less dreaded than a stain upon the lawn.

Cranmer was, as we have said, rewarded with the see of Canterbury, and his conduct in respect to this appointment is another reproach upon his name. He had sense enough to know that the claims of the Roman government were unfounded; and knowing this, he must have seen that the same power could not be placed in other hands. If we may trust his biog-

rapher, he encouraged Henry to assume the supremacy in spiritual matters, though, after the affair of the divorce, he could not be ignorant for what purpose it was wanted, nor how it was likely to be abused. His whole conduct is of a piece with this. Professing that he could not conscientiously acknowledge the Pope's authority, he accepted the appointment from his hands. Though he could not conscientiously take the oath of consecration, nevertheless take it he did, making at the same time a protest, which amounted to a recantation at the same place and hour. The worthy biographer is a little troubled by this proceeding of the reformer, which certainly savours of the practices once attributed to Rome ; but he escapes from his difficulty in a way which would not have occurred to ordinary minds. Considering the great benefits likely to result from the appointment, he thinks it allowable to stretch the conscience a little ; and moreover he says, the prevarication was not so bad as was often resorted to by Cranmer's opposers. We have no doubt that he has hit upon the very reasoning which wrought upon the mind of the reformer himself. He saw a great advantage likely to result to himself and the public, which he would not forego for a trifle ; and perhaps the Reformation was the more popular from this public manifesto, which showed that those who renounced the authority of Rome, need not give up the immunities and exemptions, which that power offered to those who wished to reconcile their interest with their duty.

What kind of logic was used on these occasions, we learn from a remark of Cranmer to Sir Thomas More. When that distinguished man was sentenced to death for denying the king's supremacy, Cranmer, who knew his excellence and value, made some attempt to save him ; not, however, by influencing the mind of the king, but by trying to induce the prisoner to abandon his convictions. Sir Thomas More confessed to Cranmer that he had some doubts as to the Pope's authority ; to which the prelate replied ;—' You doubt the extent of your obligation to the Pope ; you have no doubt that you are bound to obey the king ; let the doubtful give way to the certain.' But the philosopher was not convinced. He saw it was begging the question. The very thing to be decided, was, how far he must carry his obedience to the king. Nothing in English history surpasses the firmness of More and Fisher, the latter of whom had opposed the king's divorce, and now stood out against his spiritual usurpation. Historians condemn their cause while

they praise their self-devotion. But the cause was a good one ; for the question was, not whether the Roman power should be put down, but whether it should be translated without limitation or abatement into the hands of an oppressor, whose authority was already far too great for the honor and happiness of his people. Believing as they did, they acted nobly. They were unhonored martyrs to their duty and their God.

The precedent of the king's divorce and marriage was one too much to his taste not to be followed. Accordingly, in three years, Anne, who had the folly, to call it by no harsher name, to marry the husband of another, was compelled in turn to submit to a heavier doom. It is not to be supposed that Cranmer could look without self-reproach on the royal villany of which he had been made the tool, nor could the youth and loveliness of the victim fail to move his heart, which was naturally kind. Besides, his own character was concerned, and he foresaw, as it accordingly happened, that he should soon be obliged to wrong his conscience again. He therefore interceded with his master ; but the remonstrance must have been a gentle one, for it did not move Henry to passion. His intercession was disregarded ; and what steps were taken by his Grace ? Did he retreat from his post of dishonor ? Did he declare to his sovereign and the world, that he would no longer be made the instrument of crime ? He did no such thing. He still considered, as his biographer has it, the great public advantage there was in his keeping his station, and he did not strain at the camel in his generous regard to party. Therefore, when Anne admitted that before her marriage she had been engaged to the Duke of Northumberland, ' the sorrowing primate pronounced the sentence of divorce,'—sorrowing, no doubt, that his interest required him to give a judgment so shameless ; a judgment which made him the servant of adultery and murder ; which destroyed a lovely woman, and disinherited and dishonored her child ; and sorrowing most of all, at the prospect that his unquestionable duty to his king, would compel him to break every law of God. His biographer, confident as he is of the merit of his subject, feels as if some slight apology was needed here. ' To have served the queen in the public manner which some affirm to be necessary to the honor of his character, was impossible.' And why ? ' Because during the trial he was forbidden to leave his house.' But there are some, who, though no reformers, would have found it possible to make themselves

heard, and who would have left their house on such an occasion, though their next step had been to the 'house appointed for all the living.'—Great is the exultation with which the author parades a circumstance, which, in his opinion, shows that courtly compliance was not one of the faults of Cranmer. It seems that some one applied to Cromwel for a dispensation permitting him to marry his neice; but Cranmer, when he heard of it, was moved with a righteous indignation, and refused to comply. It is not pretended that anything was to be gained by consenting, or hazarded by refusing; and no one believes that in such cases the primate would swerve from his duty, so that there is really no call for the author's triumphant acclamations. It is however only a show of confidence. Though he will not admit that anything was wrong, he is not quite satisfied, and closes, with a tone of pious resignation, in the words; 'Perfection belongs to no man. There is none that doeth good—no, not one.' In fact there was something deplorably wrong.

We are aware that there was another pretext for Anne's divorce, founded on the king's previous intimacy with her sister; but whether this alters the case, our readers can decide. These statements admit no contradiction, and we are wholly at a loss to know, how he can be justified in a proceeding so unworthy of his character and station. The matter was doubtless generally regarded in that day as it is in ours; and those who dared to speak their sentiments, declared as much, in language more expressive than we should care to repeat; witness Peyto, who charged the king to his face, with the wrongs done to the innocent; and his fellow friar, Elston, who proclaimed in public, that the king was guilty of adultery, and when threatened with drowning, stoutly replied, that he could go to heaven by water as well as by land. Cranmer was bound to bear witness against these offences; and if too timid to open his mouth in presence of the king, he had no business in his exalted station. He was bound to resign it to some one who cared less for his safety than his duty, and since he thought not proper either to discharge the obligations or give up the honors of office, there can be but one sentiment respecting his conduct in every impartial breast.

It is difficult now to ascertain how far Cranmer carried his compliance with the humor of his royal master. There were times when he opposed Henry's wishes; once in the law enforcing the celibacy of the clergy, which obliged him to send



away his own wife, and again in the disposal of the property plundered from the monasteries, which Cranmer wished to appropriate to the support of religion. But his opposition, however sincere, was unavailing; and since Henry was not incensed by it, we cannot believe that it was very hearty, for there does not appear to have been a solitary instance of this king's encountering resistance, without fierce resentment against his opposers. It is doubted whether Cranmer believed the doctrine of the real presence, which he renounced in the succeeding reign, or only maintained it, even to the blood of those who questioned it, through fear of Henry. Indeed it does seem as if this would be the point which reformers would first reject in reforming the old religion. But it will not do to reason from our own conclusions to theirs; for we find the Lutherans and other reformers on the continent, maintaining the same opinion. We see no reason, then, to doubt that he really believed this doctrine in the time of Henry, and perhaps it was natural that the most irrational doctrine of the ancient faith, should have been like the weakest child of the affections, most fondly loved and unwillingly surrendered.

The next thing which bears hard on the character of Cranmer, is the intolerance displayed by him in some instances of persecution. But before we fix the measure of this reproach, we must remember that intolerance was the order of the day. It is a stain from which hardly one great name is free. Even Sir Thomas More, in other respects so enlightened, seems to have caught the universal spirit in this; and so far as we may judge from the conduct of the different parties, it seems to have been thought, not a generous indeed, but still a fair and natural use of power. The complaints of the infamous cruelties of Mary's reign have been growing louder and louder from that time to the present. But then, the principal cause of censure seems to have been the number of her victims. The reformers themselves could hardly object to the principle which they had recommended by their own example. Difference of religious opinion seems to have been regarded, by common consent, as a crime worthy of death, and it was for the party in power to determine to whom this notable rule of justice should be applied. Even Mary, whose name has been a by-word for so many generations, is entitled to the full benefit of this explanation. She acted after the manner of the times; a convenient example for those whose tempers inclined them

to severity, and a temptation to all who wished to indulge revengeful passions, under the name of conscience and religion.

In the case of Joan Bocher, however, Cranmer has deprived himself of the benefit of this excuse, by going beyond his day. This woman had preached Unitarianism, as it was called, though her sentiments are not stated with much precision. Her own account of them was, 'that Christ did not take flesh of the outward man of the Virgin, because the outward man was conceived in sin; but by the consent of the inward man which was undefiled.' If this does not explain the matter, we know not what will. For this alarming doctrine, thus luminously expounded, she was brought before the inquisition in which Cranmer presided, and there persevering in her heresy, she was condemned to die. Our author praises the humanity of the reformer for his attempt to make her renounce her opinion; a sort of tender mercy which was afterwards imitated by the Catholics in their treatment of him. But an unexpected obstacle arose in the resistance of the young king Edward, whose gentle nature revolted at the thought of such a punishment for such a crime, but who, not daring to question the justice of her sentence, disguised his horror under the plea of unwillingness to send her to eternal punishment in another world. Unfortunately, the noble boy of eleven, proved no match for the veteran reformer of sixty, who combatted his objections with theological arguments, to which he could oppose nothing but the feelings of nature. He signed the warrant at last, with tears in his eyes. Little did the prelate think, in the midst of his conscientious exultation, that he was filing a bloody precedent, to which his enemies, at some future time, might triumphantly refer as a warrant for his own awful doom.

But while we allow this justification of such deeds derived from the practice of that day, as far as it may reasonably go, we must say that it makes a material difference in our sympathy with the persecutors, when they in turn become the victims. To know that Rogers publicly approved the burning of Joan, would shock even the infants who have wept for him and his ten children; and though we cannot help feeling for Cranmer in the hours of his mortal agony, we know that he was a martyr to his own fatal example, as well as to the truth. When historians demand our sympathy for the suffering reformers, we cannot withhold it; but when they throw similar deeds of the reformers into shadow, and hold up those of the Catholics

to reprobation, we are compelled to say that they shared the guilt in nearly equal proportions. We feel, too, as if they of the purer faith might have shown themselves more merciful. We regret that their cruelties should have dishonored the cause of truth; and most deeply do we lament, that, instead of guiding the community to a better feeling, they needed themselves to be restrained and bounded by the general feeling of the people, whom they were leading in a necessary and just reform.

Again; Cranmer is implicated in the daring plot for changing the succession, under the pretence of saving the Protestant faith, but really to place the power in the hands of Northumberland. The right of Mary was unquestionable. It was secured by act of parliament and by Henry's will, besides that in those days of divine right, she was by birth the legitimate heir to the throne. The plan of Northumberland was, to set her claims aside, on the pretext that the act of parliament which excluded her, had never been repealed, and to place the crown on the head of Jane Gray, granddaughter of a younger sister of Henry, hoping that by the marriage of Jane to his son, he might himself be sovereign in everything but the name. Had his plan succeeded, he would certainly have governed with royal power; for the Lady Jane, though mature beyond her years, was a girl of sixteen, unacquainted with her claims and averse to such honors, and his son was young and entirely under his control. The youthful king was easily brought, by religious considerations, to take an interest in this plan, and he made a will excluding Mary and Elizabeth from the succession, and entailing the crown on the descendants of his aunt, the queen of France.

It will be remembered that Edward was in a manner under the guardianship of Cranmer, who was one of the executors of his father's will. In religious matters especially, it was the primate's duty to guard him from undue influence, and both as a friend and counsellor, to take the most decided stand against any measure which he knew to be unjust. That he did regard this exclusion of Mary as oppressive and unjust, he has himself declared. He tells us that for a long time he refused his consent; and at last was prevailed upon to act against his conscience by the entreaties of the king. By thus assuring us how strong were his convictions of Mary's right, he has testified against himself, that, with his eyes open, he was guilty of

treason to the state and unfaithfulness to the king, to whom at all hazards, he should have pointed out the path of duty. The excuses made for him let us into the secrets of his character. It seems that he required a private interview, because the presence of Northumberland prevented his speaking freely ; and as this was not granted, there is no evidence that he made any attempt, beyond a statement of his own scruples, to shake the determination of the king. Our author, on the authority of his own imagination, tells us that Cranmer refused to consent, till he had consulted the judges, who gave their opinion that he might consistently take the oath required. This would have made no difference whatever. But it is well known that the judges were convinced that the proceeding was illegal, and would not acquiesce till they were overawed by all the power of the council and the king. Still the undaunted biographer, while he allows that Cranmer was 'amenable to censure,' thinks that admiration must preponderate in our view of his part in this transaction. But we confess, that we are inclined to transfer our share of the admiration to his biographer, who has succeeded in persuading himself that his hero was innocent, in the face of his own acknowledgment that he was guilty. Furthermore, he insists that whatever blame there might have been in the transaction, was effaced by his subsequent contrition. But it happens that the proof of this contrition is found in his letter to Mary, written with the express purpose of deprecating her displeasure. We have no doubt that he was penitent enough, when the plan had failed, when the crown had fallen from the head of the lovely usurper, and it only remained for the season of vengeance to succeed. We doubt not that a similar chill ran through the breasts of all the partners in this deed ; for they had added fire to the wrath of a princess, which burned fiercely enough before. They had afforded ample grounds for a charge of treason. By their dangerous enterprise they had made Mary popular in the state, and given her a pretext for resisting the Protestant religion. Cranmer, above all the rest, had been the main instrument in that transaction which broke the heart of her injured mother, and brought reproach on her own birth. He had been the most earnest opposer of that faith which she as earnestly maintained. By his last act, he had shown himself willing to strip her of her birthright, and to make her an exile in the midst of that land which she was born to govern. In a condition like



that in which the primate stood, it may well be supposed, that his was a sort of deathbed repentance, with less remorse in it than despair.

Cranmer seems to have felt that he had nothing to hope for from the magnanimity or mercy of the queen. These were qualities in which none of the Tudors abounded. Mary and Elizabeth were equally deficient in these estimable virtues, which, if history speaks truth, are not apt to find their most familiar dwelling in royal breasts. It must be owned, that he had given provocation enough to incense one more generous than Mary; but she was contented with ordering him to confine himself to his palace, and did not then threaten anything severer. Still he was fully aware of the manner in which all parties follow up their victories, and it seems evident from his subsequent conduct, that he had wrought himself up to uncommon resolution, by reflecting perhaps on the magnitude of the cause of which he was counted the pillar, and considering what lofty firmness would naturally be expected from the head of a reforming party. While in this state of uncertainty, he heard that mass had been performed in his church at Canterbury, and that he himself had consented to celebrate the Catholic service in presence of the queen. He immediately came out with a denial and a public declaration of hostility to the Catholic religion, stating that the mass was full of horrible blasphemies and invented by the father of lies. This paper was remarkable for its boldness, and gave so much offence that he was sent for by the council, arraigned for treason and sedition, and committed to the Tower, a prison whose threshold was little worn by returning feet.

Far are we from justifying these abominations, but we must distribute our condemnation with impartiality. Can there be a doubt, that if any one in the preceding reigns, had thrown contempt on the prevailing faith, he would have been treated with equal harshness, or that Cranmer would have consented to his doom? Such doubts are answered by the fate of Lambert, Bocher, Paris, and others more than one. We see no right that one party had to persecute more than another, nor any justification to be made for one, in which the other may not share.

The courage of the prelate did not hold out to the last. His spirit, perhaps, was broken by imprisonment, and by witnessing the death of his associates, whom he expected to follow

soon. The Catholic party were anxious to gain so distinguished a convert, or at least to make him faithless to his own opinions. They endeavoured to wear him out by disputation, and flattered him with a hope that he might save his life and honors by renouncing his opinions. Believing that the same favor would be extended to him as to others, he fully abjured his Protestant faith, and, in several instruments, professed his acquiescence in that religion he had so long opposed. He even applied for a reprieve long enough to show that he had sincerely repented, and to remove the scandal which his heretical life had given. But the infamous council, though they knew that his confessions were dictated by that hope which they had themselves encouraged, refused him the privilege they had offered to Ridley and Latimer, and decreed that nothing should save him.

The wretched man then awoke to a full sense of his dishonor. The ears of Protestant England were stunned with the intelligence that the great apostle of reform had denied the faith. Their eyes were bent reproachfully upon him. They trusted that he would have defied the crown, and borne a testimony in his last hours, which all Europe would have heard. Perhaps it was his consciousness of the general shame and indignation, which restored courage to his heart. He resolved to take the opportunity, which the last hour afforded him, to redeem the honor of his name. A paper was prepared for him to read at the stake, that the spectators might be edified by his confession of weakness; and Catholic historians are malecontent that he should have deceived his tormentors in a matter which they had so much at heart. We cannot join in their censure. We think he was in no wise bound to warn them of his purpose. It would have been the very foolishness of sincerity to have thrown away the last chance of doing justice to his Protestant opinions. It was with no little dismay, that they heard him recall his recantations, one by one, declaring that nothing but the hope of life had wrung them from him. He then held the hand which had written them in the flames till it was consumed, and thus did all that a dying man could do, to remove the reproach of his former weakness. But though the Protestants maintain that the guilt of his apostasy was done away by this act, it is but too evident that he would have clung to life, if submission could have saved him; that he did not resume his fidelity till hope was all gone, and that his courage was borrowed less from religion than despair.

It will be readily inferred from what we have said, that we are no admirers of Cranmer, and we believe that his reputation rests upon party feeling. Still, the reverence for his name is so universal, that we have thought it necessary to dwell principally on the more questionable parts of his character. It would be unjust to deny that there are indications of great kindness in his temper, and occasional generosity in his feelings. He was happy in the affection of his friends, and the attachment of a large and powerful party. But we think we have shown, that, as a public man, he was wanting to his own character and duty ; that he sanctioned, and even took part in transactions, which he was bound to condemn without measure, and suffered his attachment to his sovereign and his party to make him unfaithful at times to his country and his God. His errors seem to have been often sins of weakness. He was timid and irresolute, and not the less so for the boldness which he showed, when he was driven to despair. He was easily swayed by gratitude, we fear we must add by interest also, beyond the strict bounds of moral obligation. The truth seems to have been that he was fitted for private life, where the dangers, trials, and temptations were less, and evil was the hour in which he left it to aid in a Reformation which could have gone on as well without him. From that hour, he seems to have drifted upon the stormy tides of party, and to have maintained his ascendant, not by pressing gallantly forward to a certain harbour, but by changing his course as the wind might happen to blow. That he was instrumental in advancing a great religious reform, will not entitle him to the great name of reformer. He did not, like Luther, go out to strive against old abuses with a towering self-devotion. He was not ready to sacrifice everything to the great cause of truth. He did not speak with a voice of deep and burning conviction, which must and would be heard. He was not found to defend his cause, with all the world against him, nor did he master the fear of death, till he found that no submission could save him from the revenge of those who were thirsting for his blood.

The time is come to read history impartially ; and such books as this, which, from whatever reasons, attempt to sustain a character which cannot stand by its own merits, will meet the fate they deserve, even though executed by much abler hands. They should have appeared a century ago, when, though an immense majority was on the Protestant side, and no Catholic

felt secure of life, the nation trembled at the very name of Rome, and by their severity against the Catholics created the alarms which disturbed them. Then, such works as these might have seemed acceptable offerings to religion. But now, when the laws injurious to Catholics are universally pronounced absurd by all but a jealous party, when the slow leave with which England lets them go has made her the wonder of the civilized world, it is of no service to any cause to represent the English reformers as irreproachable, in the face of history, and to speak of the Pope as if he were still in all his glory, with the nations at his feet. Every one knows, that Catholics as well as Protestants are changed; that Catholics no more maintain the principles of three hundred years ago, than Protestants believe the real presence as in the times of Henry. In fact, all sects are assimilating, not by any effort of charity, but by the natural effect of time. The Calvinist, instead of election, talks of the unconditional freeness of the gospel. The Methodist leaves his unpainted chapel, and must have his learned preacher with his spire and bell. Even the Shaker substitutes a grave walk for his rigadoon. No sect, however unsocial and exclusive, can possibly remain uninfluenced by the changes of the world. It is only by keeping them out of the reach of improvement, an experiment which has been tried with some success in Ireland, that Catholics can be made to retain their unfavorable distinctions. Remove the ban, and they move abreast with Protestants in the upward march of improvement. Remove the jealousies which it now rests with the Protestants to dispel, and they will join heart and hand with the Protestants, in the great cause of God and man. The Catholics, it must be remembered, have a religion, one of the various forms of Christianity; and there are examples enough to show that Catholics can have all the earnestness, humility, and excellence of the gospel. If their faith led to excesses in past ages, they are not answerable for the deeds of their fathers; and it is not for Protestants to cast the first stone.

---



ART. III.—*Sermons by the late Rev. Joseph S. Buckminster, now first published from the Author's Manuscripts.* Boston. Carter & Hendee. 1829. 8vo. pp. 358.

THE history of public preaching might open a fruitful subject of inquiry. To say nothing of its state under the Jewish dispensation, it might be interesting and instructive, could adequate materials be found, to trace its various progress and influence, from its commencement under the gospel, when our Saviour 'began to teach and to preach,' when Peter arose in the midst of the assemblies of Jerusalem, and Paul stood upon Mars' Hill to declare to the men of Athens the 'unknown God,'—through their immediate successors, the early Fathers, as they are called, and the preachers of the Reformation, to the present day.

It would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to execute such a work with any good measure of fidelity, without access to more copious stores, than any of our libraries at present supply, and we know not that it has as yet been undertaken. The brief dissertation of Robert Robinson, with which he has prefaced his celebrated notes to Claude's *Essay on the Composition of a Sermon*, and one or two even smaller works, are the only attempts of this nature in our own language, with which we, at least, are acquainted. But they furnish only the most general hints of what might be accomplished, and leave us to a strong desire, that a subject, so curious and so copious of instruction, may not long be left without faithful investigation. Robinson has spread before us his plan. He has just opened an enchanting field, and told us of the fair fruits that might be gathered; but for want of materials, he has left it almost wholly unexplored. We wish, therefore, that some true lover of ecclesiastical antiquity and diligent reader of sermons, full of learning or willing to become so, would adopt his purpose, and do something towards its accomplishment. He need only lift up his eyes, and he will see a field white already to harvest. From the preachers of the primitive church; from Basil, Chrysostom of Antioch, and Gregory Nazianzen, among the Greeks; from Jerome and St Austin among the Latins, he might collect fair and abundant fruit, not indeed without some dry leaves and painful thorns, yet 'pleasant to the eye, and good to make wise.'

From their day to that of the Reformation, amidst growing corruptions of doctrine and enormities in practice, when many of the clergy were as ignorant and debased as the people they professed to instruct, and some even of the prelates could not read, the history of the pulpit must be very obscure and unsatisfactory. Through the whole of that dark period, it was grossly perverted from its high purposes. It was made to minister to the vanity and ambition of a favorite preacher, and what was worse, to the passions of the people. Robinson tells us, and we learn from other sources, that the people for a time were suffered to express their delight or their disapprobation by the shaking of their heads, or the lifting of their hands, till, at length, it proceeded to loud acclamations or hisses, and the abuse could be tolerated no longer. But even this indecorum of occasional applause was known in the best days of England. It is related of one celebrated divine of the court of Charles II., that he was sometimes obliged to wave his hand to suppress the growing tumult; but of another, no less than Burnett, who, however, has not recorded it in the *History of his own Times*, that while the 'welcome murmur was breathing around him,' he sat back in the pulpit refreshed and delighted, not willing that any portion of its sweetness should waste itself unheard.

After the labors of Wickliffe, in the fourteenth century, and of Luther and Melancthon, of Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer, in the sixteenth, preaching was restored to its proper province, and was a mighty instrument in the hands of this goodly company of confessors and reformers, of exposing the errors of past times, and of diffusing the light of truth. From this period, at least in Great Britain, its history might without much difficulty be traced to the present day. Either in the sermons themselves of their distinguished divines, or in the authentic records of their lives, its peculiar characteristics and influences might, at successive periods, be distinguished. The ancient folios of Andrews, Reynolds, and Hall of Norwich; of Hooker, Wilkins, and Jeremy Taylor; the discourses of Leighton, Barrow, Tillotson, and South; of the many learned and eminent among the Non-conformists, of whom were Owen and Bates, Charnock, Baxter, and Howe; in those also of a later day, as Atterbury and Clarke, Sherlock and Secker, of the Establishment; with Watts, Doddridge, Grove, Harris, and Lardner, Jennings, and Chandler—in all these and others of the Dissenters, whose names alone would exceed our limits, might the

faithful historian of the pulpit, find ample materials for his purpose. In truth, a multitude of preachers, even 'an exceeding great army,' would at once rise up to his view. Nor in surveying, as he must, their countless works, would he have just reason to say, with the prophet in the valley of vision, 'Behold! they are very dry.' For with all imaginable varieties of excellences and defects, it will not be denied, that, regarded as a whole, the sermons of English divines, of past and present times, within and without the pale of the church, furnish a body of theological instruction, of scripture illustration, and of practical religion, of wholesome doctrine and useful precept, with which, no other nation of Christendom can compare.

It might be a more difficult and less gratifying task to trace the art of preaching on the continent, and especially among the Catholic nations of Europe. For it was at no period the policy of the church of Rome to cherish a habit of inquiry among the people, or to invite them to search for a reason, when it called upon them to obey a command. Though that church, even in Italy, has produced some great orators, and Bourdaloue, Fléchier, Bossuet, and Massillon, with others among the French, may be adduced as illustrious exceptions, yet it has never, we believe, regarded preaching as an essential duty of its priests; and however it may boast itself of occasional effects from the sermons of such as Savonarola, or Cepistran, or Narni, it will not be denied, that the pulpits of the Catholic churches have often been degraded by the lowest ignorance and the most revolting absurdities.

In Protestant Germany, in Geneva, and like favored portions of Switzerland, there are, and there have been, we know, many learned and eloquent preachers. Formey, Zollikoffer, and Ostervald (we name him for his unwearied as well as intelligent devotion to his flock), are only, we suppose, among the many deserving of honor. Recent travellers and journalists commend the talents and character of others now living. And though our own knowledge of the subject is very limited, yet we should infer, from all that is now written and said, that in the Protestant churches of both these countries, the standard of preaching is high; that the people by their attention conspire with the clergy to improve it, and that the pulpit is regarded as it should be, the great theatre of the gospel, and among the most effectual means of grace.

In our own country, and especially in New England, the earlier history of the pulpit would be found intimately associated with our civil, literary, and all other history. It might be pursued without interruption, from the administration—and we use the term in somewhat of its technical sense—of Cotton, one of the first ministers of the first church, who could put a stop to the progress of a doubtful law, by showing to the General Court his opinion at a Thursday Lecture, for attendance on which they had adjourned their session,—to the present times, when even to touch upon party politics or masonry, might put to hazard a minister's place.

Our fathers, as true descendants from the Puritans, for a century or more, retained the peculiarities of their preaching. For, notwithstanding an occasional dissent, or a bold vindication, as by Roger Williams, of the sacredness of religious liberty, few changes occurred of importance either in the modes of opinion or preaching, before the appearance of the celebrated Whitefield. At that time the Old Arminians, as they have since been called, *clarum et venerabile nomen*, of whom, in spirit, though not in name, amidst prevailing errors God has always preserved in his churches a faithful race,—had the wisdom and courage to oppose themselves to the excesses of the times; and, both by their judicious preaching and their weight of character, stemmed the torrent of fanaticism that threatened to overwhelm the people. Their efforts, as do always the counsels of prudence when opposed to bigotry and misrule, prevailed; and the fruits of their moderation were seen for many years,—would that they had been perpetual—in the harmony and charity of the churches.

To the ministry of Mayhew and of Chauncy, which extended—the former to more than twenty, the latter to more than forty years beyond this period—may doubtless be ascribed an important revolution in the history of the New England pulpit. The learning, wisdom, and piety of these great men, left their impress upon the generation that followed. Men heard from their lips, dispensed with boldness and simplicity, the plain doctrines of the gospel. They heard, also, especially from Mayhew, of the rights of private judgment, and of the liberty and obligation of every Christian to search the scriptures for himself. The same spirit, which characterized their preaching; the same preference of revealed truth to human inventions, or points of doubtful disputation; the same rational and earnest



inculcation of gospel virtue as the test of character and the condition of salvation, were prominent graces in the preaching of Clarke, Belknap, and Howard, and of others, their cotemporaries, whom we need not name. We trust that such graces will never cease to honor those who succeed them; and in this hope we must hasten to present to our readers another volume of sermons, from one whose preaching was itself a memorable era in the history to which we have alluded, and which is distinguished, not less by other qualities we are yet to notice, than by the freedom and catholicism which connect Mr Buckminster's with the best works of Mayhew, and by which, indeed, they are like his pervaded.

This volume has been prepared by the friends of the author, and the discourses selected, almost entirely, from his hitherto unpublished manuscripts. It opens with a discourse on Providence; and, if we mistake not, there are many still among us, who, on looking over its pages, will recall the satisfaction with which they heard it from the lips of the preacher. They cannot, indeed, read the voice, the looks, the manner, which gave such sweetness and power to the thought, but they will not fail to recognise some of the characteristic excellences both of his spirit and style.

Having remarked the importance of referring all to God, and of making the belief of his providence a fixed habit of the mind; having explained what is to be understood by a paternal providence, and deduced from the nature of God as a spirit, as well as his relation to the world as its Creator, from the interest which he has shown in it by imparting an express revelation, from the observation of nature, and from the history of mankind, various proofs of this great doctrine, the preacher proceeds;—

‘From the explanations I have given, and from the course of my remarks, it must have appeared, that there is no foundation for the usual distinction between a general and a particular providence; for so intimate are the mutual dependences of animate and inanimate creation, that no providence can be general, which includes not every individual being, and the same arguments which prove that God takes notice of anything, prove that his providence extends equally to all.

‘It shall now be my object to deduce some practical reflections from this most interesting subject.

“For of him, and through him, and to him are all things.” How grand then is God! Christians, have you ever contemplated the wonderful magnificence of this controller of the universe? “Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, nor is weary?” The human mind, trying to form a conception vast enough to embrace the peculiar grandeur of God, feels the insufficiency of its powers, and finds astonished, how narrow is its boasted capacity! We find that to understand his excellence by a single act of comprehension, we must possess a mind equal to his own. I say then again, how inexpressibly great is that being who penetrates at once the recesses, and circumscribes within himself the boundless ranges of creation; who pierces into the profound meditations of the most sublime intelligence above, with the same ease that he discerns the wayward projects of the child; who knows equally the abortive imaginations and the wisest plans of every creature that ever has thought, or that ever will think, throughout the realms of intellect. How transcendent that mind, to which all other minds are infinitely inferior, from the lofty seraph that stands near his throne, down to the poor idiot who is incapable of forming a conception of his Maker. How vast that comprehension, to which all the sciences of all the ages of the world, are not less simple, nor less intelligible, than the first proposition of the infant’s earliest lesson. How wonderful is that power, which wields with equal ease the mightiest, and the feeblest agents; directs the resistless thunderbolt, or wafts a feather through the air; bursts out in the imprisoned lava, or rests on the peaceful bosom of the lake; rides on the rapid whirlwind, or whispers in the evening air. Think, I pray you, of that wisdom which conducts, at the same moment, the innumerable purposes of all his creatures, and whose own grand purpose is equally accomplished by the failure or by the success of all the plans of all his creatures. Think of him under whom all agents operate, because by him all beings exist. Think of him who has but to will it, and all moving nature pauses in her course, chaos succeeds to the harmony of innumerable spheres, and eternal darkness overwhelms this universe of light. Yet in the midst of darkness his throne is stable, and all is light about the seat of God. “Such knowledge is too wonderful for us; for it is high, we cannot attain unto it.”—pp. 22-24.

In the third and fourth sermons, the Evidences of Retribution for Sin, and the Disclosures of a Future Judgment, are exhibited with great solemnity and earnestness. These two dis-

courses, though distinct in their topics, are yet closely connected, and together present some of the most awakening and affecting considerations, which subjects of this moment ought always to suggest, but which are so apt to be forgotten. In the latter discourse, the admirers of Massillon might at first view imagine some coincidences, in thought or in illustration, with the celebrated sermon of that preacher on the Last Judgment. But upon a careful comparison of both, it will appear that the coincidence is of a nature inseparable from the subject; at least, from any just or useful consideration of it; while it will also be seen with what original and characteristic beauties Mr Buckminster could at pleasure adorn and impress those truths, on which, from the importance of the topics and the obligation on every christian teacher of frequently presenting them, it would seem impossible to avoid repeating what has been often repeated before. In the former discourse, in pointing out the various evidences of the divine government, the preacher observes;—

‘But the most important witness of the moral and judicial government of God, is undoubtedly to be found within the mind itself. When we speak of conscience, every man knows what we mean; for its tribunal is within him, and this vicegerent of the divine justice exercises a power, from which it is impossible entirely to escape, though it is sometimes silenced, corrupted, or deceived. This it is, which makes cowards of the most abandoned in the hour of death, which flashes its light into the most secret retreats of the guilty, and breathes an acknowledged horror over the prosperity of the wicked. This it is, which renders the face of nature horrible to the man, who bears about with him the worm that never dies; this is the avenger, which waits only for a moment of solitude, or an interval of retirement, to make the proudest and most important of villians weary of life, and if it find him never alone, pursues him even in his dreams, and terrifies him with visions of the night. It is a rewarder also, as well as a punisher; an approver, as well as a condemner. It is regarded not merely as a strong indication of the divine government, but as constituting the most extensive and effectual provision which God has made for the administration of justice; and there is no man who has ever fallen under its sentence, who will not confess that it is the minister, as well as the interpreter of divine justice.

‘Has your conscience ever reproached you? Did it not then, at that very moment, lift a corner of the veil which is yet drawn

over this scene of future judgment? Every public oath, every faltering perjury, every dying confession, every prayer for mercy, every face pale with falsehood, and every wild look of despair, is an appeal, which our reason acknowledges, to this future tribunal.

‘When Paul was reasoning of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled. The rising of the procurator from his seat, was itself a proclamation, loud as the voice of the inspired apostle, that the doctrine which he taught was no chimera. But if the Roman governor chooses, let him refer these suggestions of his troubled mind to the class of superstitious delusions, and maintain that these suggestions do not demonstrate such a retribution as the apostle was preaching. Be it so then; and let Felix take his seat again, and demand another proof; for conscience, though it makes us cowards, does not always make us believers. Let the trial then of the innocent proceed. Let the judge, who has the preacher in his power, proceed to pass his iniquitous sentence, and cut off at once the argument and the life of the apostle. Nay, more; let him retire now with his guards, and ask, where is this judgment of which the prisoner prated so long? Now call in the spectators of this injustice, the sufferers under his administration; show the plunder which Felix has collected, the villages smoking under his rapacious edicts. Let them hear the cries of his innocent victims, and the loud appeals to Heaven, from every part of Judea, against the cruelty of the unprincipled procurator; and then ask them whether Paul’s doctrine is true, and you will hear another answer.’ pp. 46–48.

In treating of the Future State of the Just, which is the subject of the fifth discourse, the preacher announces it as his object, not so much to give definite conceptions of scenes which we can know only after our departure from this world, as to guard against some erroneous imaginations, which may render the belief in a future existence less efficacious than it ought to be. We would gladly follow the writer through the rich field of thought which he opens to us. In the discussion of it, he has assembled some of the most sublime and enlivening considerations, of which, in our present imperfect knowledge, we are perhaps capable. The intimate connexion of the present with the future; the perpetual and infinite progress of the soul in the life eternal; its advancement in knowledge; the exercise and improvement of its social and its active powers; and the wide scope that will be given to the kind affections,



which he represents as constituting an important ingredient of of heavenly felicity—these are among the topics he illustrates. Nor does he present them merely as beautiful speculations. They are exhibited in their practical influence; in their efficacy to disengage us from the world, to release us from the dominion of its cares and fears and pleasures, to exalt and sanctify the affections, and, amidst temptations and fears and griefs, to purify and sustain by hopes that are full of immortality. To those on whom either the appointments of Heaven or bitter experience of their own errors, has forced conviction of the unsatisfactoriness of this world and the necessity of looking for a better; and to those especially, who, in the sorrows of bereavement, are accustomed to seek for their solace in the prospect of a reunion with the wise and virtuous in heaven—and multitudes of such there are,—the following passages will be read, we are sure, with deep-felt satisfaction.

‘The future state of the just, we have every reason to believe, will be a state of great activity, and constant advancement in knowledge. But let us not confine our notions of our progress in another life, to the mere enlargement of our knowledge. We may hope that we shall there find goodness more in honor than knowledge, or rather, that the one will be made inseparable from the other. If we may venture to speak of those pursuits, which will be most interesting hereafter to virtuous and pious minds, they will not be the natural history of other worlds, or the astronomy of other systems, so much as the knowledge which will be communicated to us of the history of God’s providence; the reasons of many of those events which have now perplexed our philosophy, and eluded our search; the light which will be thrown upon God’s moral government of the world. How interesting, too, will be the mere knowledge of ourselves, of our past progress, of the causes which have interrupted, the trials, the privations, and the calamities, which have contributed so mysteriously to the formation of our present character. The study of man, indeed, in connexion with God, will be enough for a long life hereafter, and the knowledge of himself the most fruitful of interest to every individual. “Now we see through a glass darkly.” This world and our own characters are full of enigmas. “Then we shall know even as we are known,” and it will be no small accession of knowledge to know ourselves, even as we are known by others.

‘As every consideration leads us to believe that the future life will be a social state, therefore love, kind affections, and

good will, are to constitute the real reward, the true felicity of heaven. We say that the future state will be a social state. Are we not authorized to say this, by that language of scripture, which speaks of the assemblies of just men made perfect, and of the many mansions which Jesus has prepared for his followers, that where he is they may be also? Besides, if our future happiness, as we before observed, is to be the happiness of men, we know of none, except that which depends on the mere gratification of the senses, which may not be communicated to others, and which is not increased by this participation. We are to enter also a state of retribution, and it is difficult to imagine how that retribution can be accomplished, if all the relations with those among whom we have lived, giving and receiving good or evil, are to be at once abolished. It is true, that the social character of the future state, does not necessarily suppose that former intimacies will be renewed. But if there is to be a junction of virtuous persons, it seems hardly consistent with all the analogies of nature, that those should be unknown to each other, who seem best formed for the promotion of each other's happiness; or that, where two minds have been subject to the same discipline, formed the same habits, and drawn their happiness from the same sources, they should, in another state, be cut off from an enjoyment so pure, merely in consequence of their transition to another region.

'I know that in consequence of the prodigious change effected by the dissolution of these bodies, it may be seriously doubted whether we shall have the same visible marks of mutual recognition, which now make us known to each other. But there are beings, we may hope, who could not fail of finding each other again, by those eternal and ineffaceable characters of mind and sympathies of soul, which bound them together here, more strongly than all the ties of consanguinity, or the strength of long intimacy.

'Here, then, enters the delightful thought of love purified, enlarged, and invigorated. Here we have a glimpse of self-annihilation, and of that infinite benevolence which now exists only in God. It seems, indeed, that here on earth we feel very little love, which is not in some measure supported by the relation of the object to ourselves as individuals. We see and feel ourselves in all that is about us. Very wonderful will be the change, then, if we can know in all its purity and power that affection which is satisfied with the sole pleasure of making others happy. We may even then know what it is to love God himself, not as we love him here, so feebly, so faintly, so inadequately, but supremely and unalterably, without fear, or doubt, or error.' pp. 76-78.

The discourse is thus concluded.

‘Who then are to be partakers of this life to come? The world is full of rational beings, capable of forming the conception and cherishing the hope of such an existence. But can we expect to find hereafter, in a more exalted state, all the degraded creatures who live now on the mercy and forbearance of God? Neither scripture nor reason will allow this hope. There are those who will sleep in the dust of the earth, and awake to everlasting contempt. The society of heaven cannot be composed, like the present, of the foolish and the wise, the virtuous and the profligate, the worthless and the excellent. Into the world we have been describing entereth nothing that defileth or that maketh a lie. “And I heard a voice out of heaven saying, It is done. I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the end. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the second death.”

‘How glorious are the prospects opened to the eye of faith and virtue! Separated from the wicked, to dwell only with the wise and virtuous, to act with them, to learn with them, and to worship with them the everlasting Father; to be occupied forever in the general good of God’s creatures, and to proceed from good to better, from glory to glory!’ p. 81.

In a sermon on Religious Seriousness, the writer distinguishes, with philosophical accuracy, between that seriousness which is the genuine result of deep impressions of religion, and some other states of mind which may be mistaken for it, or are sometimes thought to supply its place. This is a class of subjects of great importance, on which dangerous errors prevail. He shows, that what he would recommend is something wholly different from a natural moderation; from the gravity, which comes with the pursuits of the studious and contemplative, and which may exist, like the other, with a total insensibility on religious subjects; from constitutional melancholy and a spirit of despondency; and it is with reference to the first of these, he thus delineates a character of which we may often trace the likeness amidst the bustle and selfish competitions of the world.

‘There is in some men a certain constitutional moderation and sedateness of mind, which passes for a serious temper. These are persons of extreme regularity of life; men who are

never thrown off their guard by violent emotions, either of joy or of apprehension, as to this world or the next. There is usually in such characters a great fund of wordly wisdom and of prudence, which keeps them aloof from excesses, and disposes them always to wish that the world may go on as it has done. They are afraid of any novelty or change in the state of affairs immediately around them; and hence they are the advocates for a peaceable continuance of old habits. They are what are called steady men; and are indeed of great value to the well-being of the community. They are held out to the young as examples of what they should aspire to imitate; and it is much to be desired that such a class of men, who are not the slaves of any visible vices, and not the promoters of any species of irregularity, should increase in a community and give it stability and respect. But the sedateness which arises merely from moderated passions or selfishness, and the sobriety proceeding merely from ancient and regular habits, are very different from that seriousness which is produced by an habitual contemplation of the solemn truths which the gospel unfolds to us. This constitutional solidity of character, may exist with the utmost indifference to religious truth. It may exist in a mind which never has been touched with the grand thought of eternity, and never has inquired, with trembling apprehension, what it shall do to be saved. That kind of religious insensibility, which presents nothing offensive in the external conduct, that uniform sobriety of deportment, which is never betrayed into any extravagance, which is perfectly contented with itself, and conforms to the external faith of a community, is the most difficult disposition in the world to awaken. There is no reaching such a heart by the ordinary applications from the pulpit. It is almost impracticable to probe a conscience, which has never seriously reproached itself. The character I have been describing is extremely common. It is not a religious, it is a selfish, though a regular character. The man of truly serious impressions is often exercised with the most solemn contemplations, the most moving anxiety, the most humble and devotional sentiments. Real seriousness offers a ground for continual exertion and improvement; but the mere sobriety of a worldly man, is always the same, always self-complacent, and therefore always stationary.'—pp. 119–121.

In opposition to this and other specious appearances, he exhibits some of the characteristics of true seriousness, as proved by an habitual reverence for the subjects of religion, by a devout observance of its ordinances, by the prevailing tenor of



the thoughts, and the constancy and sincerity of secret prayer. In this discourse, we believe the writer has left a transcript of his own spirit. We see in it the solemnity, with which he was himself accustomed to regard the great objects of his faith. This was a sentiment to which the sufferings of bodily infirmities may in his case have given additional tenderness. But it was a part also of his habitual piety ; and it produced an utter dislike, even an impatience which he would not repress, of that levity, flippancy, and contempt for opponents, of that rashness, also, and defiance, with which the controverted topics of religion, both in the pulpit and in familiar conversation, are too often discussed.

There is one excellence, which distinguishes these sermons, as it did indeed the whole ministry of Mr Buckminster. It is the sagacity, freedom, and power, with which he was accustomed to notice and expose the errors or vices of the fashionable and worldly. All that conventional morality, which is just observant enough of the proprieties of life to escape the world's censure, or just yielding enough to the expectations of well-bred society to secure its favor ; the alms-giving, or the help to public charities, that is no better than the sacrifice of sordidness to the dread of reproach ; that heartless commerce of visits, that would pass itself off for friendliness or hospitality ; with all the diversified forms, which envy or censoriousness, ambition, vanity, or selfishness are wont to assume—as they were the frequent subjects of his observation, so were they by him freely and fearlessly rebuked. No man detected sooner the disguises of art. His high reputation, aided by his freedom of intercourse with the various classes of society and his well known acuteness of observation, gave to even his severest animadversions upon such subjects, an authority which men of more secluded habits or less sagacious discernment, do not always possess. It was acknowledged that he was a competent judge. And though the kindness of his temper would allow him to see in the lesser follies of affectation and fashion, only an occasion for amusement or satire, yet, when he found them presuming to interfere with the claims of religion, or sheltering themselves under its name, none were more faithful than he to apply the sword of the spirit, and to probe the conscience of the offender with the word of God. The vain woman and the frivolous youth ; the slave of fashion and the hardened sensualist ; the rich man trusting in his riches, and

the proud man despising others, were never spared his intrepid rebuke, and we can even now imagine him, youthful as he was, speaking with the authority of the ancient prophets, when denouncing the judgments of Heaven upon a worldly race;—‘Tremble, ye women that are at ease, and be troubled ye careless ones;—and ye also that bear silver, shall be cut off;—for I will search Jerusalem with candles; and neither your silver nor your gold shall be able to deliver you.’ Nor, such was the union of qualities in this extraordinary man, do we believe that such admonitions would have lost any of their solemnity, even with those who were conversant with his most cheerful hours, and saw him daily in the unreserved intimacy of friendship.

Some examples of this fidelity will be found in the discourses of our author, published soon after his death; and others may be remembered by his hearers, yet living. It is also illustrated in the following paragraphs, which we extract from a sermon on *Consistency in Religion*, in the present collection.

‘In the last place, we observe the inconsistency which we have been condemning, in that partial obedience we are contented to pay to the commands of God, and in the various compensations and comparisons we make between one duty or disposition and another, both in our estimate of our own characters, and the characters of others. Thus, the avaricious and hard-hearted comfort themselves with the consciousness of their honesty, and with the plea that they are never guilty of extravagance, improvidence, luxury, or dissipation. The man of pleasure boasts of his charities, his frankness, his freedom from sordid and narrow-minded vices; and not only so, he looks with contempt on his frugal and regular neighbour. The man who has amassed a great estate by fraudulent means, will attempt to make an atonement for his former life by some occasional acts of pious munificence. In some circles beneficence has the preference; in others, commercial integrity; in others, fidelity in friendship; in others, religious zeal. We select from the universal obligations of morality, those in which we think ourselves least deficient, and look with complacency through the glass which is colored with our favorite hue.

‘This character of inconsistency, is totally distinct from that of the weak and imperfect Christian, whose strong passions occasionally surprise him into acts of which he repents, or who is sensible of the imperfection of his best services, notwithstanding his daily endeavours after improvement.

‘My friends, it becomes us most seriously to remember that the habitual and deliberate neglect of a single commandment, implies a disposition of revolt, of rebellion, and of resistance, totally inconsistent with a religious character. It implies that all our pretences of reverence for our Maker are hollow and dissembling; it implies that we practise upon ourselves delusions the most gross, when we imagine that the observance of one law, will atone for the violation of another; that a man may be charitable without being just, or just without being charitable; honorable without being pious, or pious without being honorable; sober without being chaste, punctilious without being exact, or generous without prudence and choice; zealous without being candid, or candid because indifferent and careless; ceremoniously exact without being pure within, or so pure within as to despise any aid from without.’—pp. 168–170.

We must omit, as our limits prescribe, any particular notice of the discourse on the *Peculiar Blessings of our Social Condition as American Citizens*, in which, however, the reader may find many valuable suggestions, the results of Mr Buckminster’s observation and experience both at home and abroad. While he was a traveller for health in Europe, he saw with a discriminating glance the advantages and the evils of ancient governments, and of established or overgrown institutions. He saw that with the benefits which come with time, were inseparably connected abuses, and even miseries, from which our distance and youth may protect us; and both in this and the Thanksgiving sermon on a kindred topic, which will be remembered as one of the former collection, he has presented many interesting views, which the christian philosopher and patriot will not fail to contemplate with pleasure and improvement.

There is one more discourse, on which we cannot forbear to remark. It is that on the *Example of Jesus Christ*; and it seems to us, familiar as is the topic, one of the most beautiful and instructive in this volume. It presents also some of the peculiar graces of Mr Buckminster’s preaching; and especially that felicitous use or adaptation of scripture, with which he was accustomed to illustrate or adorn his subjects, and which consists rather in allusion than in direct quotation of whole texts, which, in less skilful hands, might become too frequent and tedious, burdening rather than enforcing a topic. The writings of Robert Hall, the celebrated Baptist preacher, are distinguished

for this propriety and beauty of scriptural allusion ; and though it may not equally strike our readers, yet, should we adduce a single example from this discourse of Mr Buckminster, we should say, that for ourselves we were never so deeply impressed with a sense of our Lord's poverty, as when, in illustrating his social character, the preacher says, ' Such was our Saviour's mode of life, that he was obliged to be much in company. "Not having where to lay his head," he was frequently found at the tables of the rich and in the houses of his friends.'

The character of Jesus Christ was a favorite topic with Mr Buckminster. He understood and felt it, in all its transcendent purity, and simplicity, and grandeur. In this sense, we might say, that he entered into the 'mind of Christ;' and in the discourse to which we refer, as in many others, it may be seen with what delight, and pathos, and eloquence, he could present to view and imitation its lovely virtues. In his elevated conception of its grandeur and excellence, he overlooked or rejected the vain questions which men have raised about the metaphysical rank or nature of our Lord, and could scarcely endure that any portion of the practical influence of his moral character, should be lost amidst doubtful and unprofitable discussions. From this cause, perhaps, so far at least as any cause can be assigned for a calumny so gratuitous, he has been reproached among others, with concealment of his sentiments. In other words, it is said he held speculations which he feared to acknowledge. The indignity of this charge, so often repeated for the promotion of an unprincipled sectarianism, is equalled only by its absurdity. They who knew Mr Buckminster, know that concealment was no part of his wisdom ; and that among the personal qualities that commanded their admiration, none were more distinguished, than the 'courage and elevation, that would not suffer him to take any measure, or to behave to any man, under the influence of fear ; and the simplicity of intention and purpose, that rejected all artifice of speech and conduct.'\* In truth, the boldness, even to bluntness, with which Mr Buckminster was capable of asserting whatever either in religion, literature, or art, seemed to him important, might sometimes have been set in contrast with the usual courtesy of his manners. And they who, for their own

\* See extracts from President Kirkland's Sermon at the Funeral of Mr Buckminster, as published in the Appendix to Mr Palfrey's Historical Discourse.



poor purposes, first invented, and they who, for the same wretched purposes, have repeated the calumny, might do well to comprehend, and in their measure to imitate, his elevated conception and ardent love of truth, that would not suffer him to darken or deform it with fruitless disputation; his respect for the impressions of others, which, with some impatience of its harsh spirit, indisposed him for controversy; and, most of all, his love and charity for souls, which made welcome and venerable to his view, every form of piety, and not seldom restrained him from combatting a speculative error, lest he might loosen or impair in a devout mind, some association which time or habit had made salutary. In this he well understood the tenderness and prudence of his Master, who would not have his disciples gather up the tares, lest they should 'root up also the wheat with them.'

By those who may read these discourses, as they have been accustomed to read the productions of this eminent scholar, for their literary value, they will probably be regarded as inferior in style and execution to the former collection. They certainly do not bear marks of the same intellectual toil and elaborate composition. But it will be remembered, that they are not only, like the others, entitled to all the charity due to posthumous publications, but that from their place as a second volume, they have been selected, of necessity, from a more limited number; and also, that in the earlier series of this work, many valuable contributions were made to its practical department from the manuscripts of Mr Buckminster, which had narrowed still more the range of selection. And when we consider the shortness of his ministry, and its frequent interruptions from his constitutional malady, we are rather surprised at the industry and fidelity, which,—within the space of seven years, more than one of which was spent in distant travel for health, and in none of the residue of which was the writer negligent of pastoral duty, or sparing of his aid in the numerous literary and benevolent objects, for which it was at all times eagerly sought,—could produce so much that is worthy of his exalted reputation, and permanently beneficial to letters and to religion. In this latter object, involving the whole cause of Christianity and of theological science, he became, as he advanced in his ministry, more and more engrossed. It was the ruling passion of his soul, to which he was fast sacrificing his fondness for elegant literature and indulgence of various reading, and of which he has

himself left a strong expression in the words, with which, as we are told by his accomplished biographer, so soon united with him in an heavenly ministry, 'he closed his earthly labors in the pulpit of instruction.'—'It is the constant object of my wishes and prayers, and may it be the effect of my preaching, under the blessing of God to contribute to the formation of that noblest of characters, *the Christian*, whose love, as the apostle describes it, abounds more and more, in knowledge, and in all judgment; who approves the things that are excellent, and who remains sincere and without offence till the day of Christ.' Had it been possible, therefore, for his friends to have sought the sanction of their author for the publication of this volume, it would not, we are confident, have been withheld, desirous, as he was, above all, that his preaching should do good, and that, though these discourses might add nothing to a fame already preeminent, they might subserve a cause much dearer to his heart, the cause of evangetic piety and virtue.

It has been thought, that Mr Buckminster was accustomed to avail himself freely of his reading in the composition of his sermons. And they, who are familiar with this class of publications, particularly with those of the most celebrated French preachers, may discover, as we have already intimated, resemblances or coincidences either of thought or method, that perhaps may be considered as some departure from the standard which public opinion, and the general practice of the clergy in this country, has made allowable. Upon this point, we may just remark, that, in whatever freedom of this kind Mr Buckminster thought proper to indulge, with the openness that was so natural to him, he was free to acknowledge it; and of this, his manuscripts furnish many examples. It is also highly probable,—such was the extent and variety of his reading, and such also the retentiveness of his memory, that he sometimes confounded his recollections of the thoughts of others with his own conceptions. But even in those instances in which a resemblance may most clearly be perceived, as in the discourses on Faith in the former collection, bearing strong internal evidence of having been written after the perusal of sermons on the same topic, by Newcome Cappe,—the discriminating reader will at once perceive how little our author could have needed such extraneous help, and will scarcely fail to remark the superior energy of thought, richness of imagery, and fervor of eloquence, by which, remoulding it, as it were, in his own

mind, he would exhibit in new forms of beauty and power, what in its naked conception or leading design he had not hesitated to adopt from another. This is a freedom, which they only who need depend on it least, will most skilfully employ. And who, that is competent to judge, will doubt that it is both lawful and wise, that the faithful preacher, who would furnish solid and various instruction, should sometimes enrich his own with the thoughts of others, and that to meet the incessant demands of preparation for the pulpit, the resources of a diligent reading should come in aid of painful excogitation and original production? Let a minister maintain in his discharge of this, as well as of all other duties, a high standard of excellence, tenderness of conscience, and an inviolable integrity. Let him frankly acknowledge, if need be, the sources of his borrowed treasures, whether new or old. He will scorn to accept praises, or to deck himself in honors, not his own; nor will he leave his friends, as did a celebrated preacher of days long since past,\* to the perplexing inference, that he must have copied the sermon of a brother divine, and carelessly left it, with his own manuscripts, to the disposal of partial or unsuspecting executors, and, yet worse, to what under such circumstances could prove no other than the torturing ordeal of the press. For though not swift, as are some, to interpret Providence, we should be tempted to infer, that he who was left to a negligence like this, was suffering some portion of the infliction aforesaid denominated by divines, judicial blindness.

To no faithful minister can his weekly preparation for the instruction of his flock, be other than an anxious and arduous task. He will consecrate to it much of his time, and deem it worthy the exercise of his highest faculties. But the demands of the pulpit, as of the grave, are insatiable; and he must sometimes meet them amidst weakness and care and sorrow, when the head is sick and the heart is faint, when much must be done, and there is little time to do it. What forbids, under such circumstances, that he should mingle his own with the well digested meditations of others; or, in other words, make his people partakers of the fruits of his reading? Is he not thus in truth,—and here we are supposing, of course, a diligent im-

\* It is a singular fact, probably familiar to our readers, that the excellent sermon of Doddridge on the One Thing Needful, so often printed as a tract, was found in manuscript among the sermons of Whitefield, and ignorantly published with other works under the name of that popular missionary.

provement of the light within, with a generous acknowledgement of what may be reflected from without—is he not more faithfully discharging his duty, and, beyond comparison, more profitable to his flock, than he could possibly be in a dull repetition of a few favorite topics, which have indeed some show of novelty from their appendage to different texts, but are of little efficacy to the satisfying of the hearer? For, alas! these texts themselves shall prove but as those little by-paths, diverging from the beaten road, which tempt the traveller with the hope of some verdant and refreshing scenery, but shortly bring him back to disappointment and weariness, amidst the same barren prospects,

‘Where neither leaf nor fruit is seen,  
But all a dreary waste.’

It is not, therefore, in the number of sermons merely, which may after all present little variety of thought or instruction, and require little effort, but in the wise selection and thorough prosecution of their subjects, that the fidelity, as well as resources of a minister, are seen. For both these essentials of good preaching was the author of these discourses distinguished. He brought to his pulpit the choicest fruits of his genius and various learning; of his glowing fancy, of his exquisite taste, and above all, his sanctified soul. By those who were familiar with his habits, we are told, that ‘he wrote with rapidity, but with great intellectual toil.’ And among the effects of his preaching, of which there are distinct and grateful recollections, we have been reminded by a friend, of the testimony of a late counsellor,\* who, in the walks of his profession had attained to a fame scarcely less brilliant than his own, that the first impression he received of Christianity, to touch his heart, and to show him the beauty of holiness, was from the preaching of Mr Buckminster.

It has been asked whether, had he lived, Mr Buckminster would have met the demands of the times, and maintained his unrivalled reputation. We have no reason to doubt, that had his faculties been spared him, he would have met the demands of any age, and contributed his wonted share to its progress. For his was a spirit formed for all times; born, not only to live, but to grow immortally. He had that within him, which would engage and sanctify all his labors, and en-

\* Hon. Samuel Dexter, who for many years was a member of the Brattle Street Society.



able him to triumph even over his infirmities. Among all his graces, nothing was more beautiful than the piety, which referred his whole lot and prospects to God, and the cheerful faith, with which, silently and meekly, he bore a malady that threatened for years the prostration of his reason. We should bless the Father of Spirits for the lights which he has kindled among us, reflecting in greater or inferior measure the lustre of his own truth and goodness; and we cannot cease to bless him, for having raised up, and continued even so long, a servant so richly gifted, whose exalted powers and attainments were all the ministers of his virtue, and who, by the splendor of his fame, and the ascendancy of his character, could compel even the most frivolous and worldly to confess, that there must be something great and venerable, altogether lovely and desirable in a religion, which could command the faith, and engage the service, and so evidently sway the life of such a man.

---

ART. IV.—*The Last Autumn at a Favorite Residence. With other Poems.* By MRS LAWRENCE. Second Edition. Liverpool. G. & J. Robinson. 1829. 12mo. pp. 160.

A GREAT deal of sweet and quiet poetry, like that contained in the above named volume, is published in England, and never read, or even heard of here. This fact is sufficient to prove that the present age is a poetical one, and even more so than those which have preceded it. Waller, celebrated as he was, produced no poetry so good as much which now comes to us by accident, without fame, and without pretension. As for Duke, and Spratt, and several others of their rank, to whom Dr Johnson has given an immortality in his *Lives*, which they would never have gained for themselves, George IV. might say of them, with a little adaptation of the words of his ancient predecessor, ‘stout King Henry,’

‘I trust I have within my realm  
Five hundred as good as they.’

Of course we shall not be understood to speak in disparagement of the masters of poetry who lived in former times, and whom we hold in deep reverence. But one poet does not

make a poetical age; and we say that volumes on volumes of poetry are now published, which, without being of the highest order of excellence, are so good and so numerous, as to mark the present age as more poetical than the last.

Mrs Lawrence's little book is characterized by those qualities which we like to see, because of their appropriateness, in the poetry of a woman,—by sweetness, tenderness, and holy feeling. The principal piece, which occupies, however, but twenty pages of the volume, the last *Autumn at a Favorite Residence*, reminds us strongly of the *Pleasures of Memory*. There is the same calm, religious, twilight atmosphere about it, which hangs over the more finished production of Rogers. Mrs Lawrence's poem opens with some pretty stanzas, in which she bids farewell to the flowers which her own hands had planted, and the scenes which had witnessed all her joys and griefs. Many images of past happiness are recalled and described as the poem proceeds. What mother's heart will not be touched with this?

‘—“ And here *he* dwelt!—amid these bowers,  
Whose shrubs perfume the lawn;  
The happy birds' wild minstrelsy  
Awoke him here at dawn!”  
Pure as the blush which morning wears,  
Was that fair cheek's soft mantling hue,  
And hare-bells bathed in twilight's tears  
Ne'er matched that eye's bright sparkling blue:  
His cherub voice was on the breeze,  
His frolic step beneath those trees:  
Within that hawthorn's ancient shade,  
At noon in rosy health he played,—  
How proud each humble bud to view,  
Which in his own, *own* garden grew!  
Its circling verge his loved domain,  
Where yet some wild-grown flowers remain.  
Years have passed on, but still the place  
Sorrowing my pensive footsteps trace,  
Where tangled boughs obscure the day,  
Or but admit a sickly ray,  
Where the pale pink more pallid grows,  
And faint and scentless droops the rose.

'T was here, secure from sorrow's blast,  
His bright and brief existence past,  
E'en like the wind-harp's thrilling strain,  
'T was sweet, but ne'er shall wake again!

'What visions cloud these parting hours,  
What sadness shrouds the fading bowers!  
Haste! haste! and bid these shades adieu,  
Which thus my bursting grief renew!  
Why stream my tears, why bleeds my heart,  
From scenes thus steeped in woe to part?  
My child! my child!—no more thy name  
These faltering, trembling lips proclaim;  
No soft voice answers from those shades,—  
He comes not bounding through the glades!

'Radiant with health and bloom he rose  
That morning from his blest repose,  
To press e'er evening, changed and low,  
That couch which ne'er shall dawn-light know.

'O Memory, cease!—O Time, control  
The grief, which deep within my soul  
A hidden volume lies,—  
Of other griefs the wounds have healed,  
Of other tears the source been sealed,  
And passing years have o'er my head  
The dews of blest oblivion shed,  
For many a later pain;  
But this, undying, undecayed,  
Can only with existence fade,  
One only consolation know,  
Of all that earth and skies bestow,—  
This world alone divides us now,  
—In Heaven we meet again!'

pp. 7-10.

The pictures of domestic scenery which are drawn, are truly English. The following description of a rookery, will awaken some pleasant recollections in those who have visited the mother country, where almost every old mansion has in its immediate neighborhood an aerial colony, who seem to be as really tenants of the estate, as the cottagers below them.

'Farewell, ye old *patrician* trees,  
Proud ornament of scenes like these:  
Ye lofty elms! whose boughs have seen  
Two hundred springs renew your green,  
And spread o'er pleasures long decayed,  
Your deep and venerable shade—  
Dear to the rooks;—in earliest Spring  
The busy tribes were on the wing,

When March winds bowed the tree's tall crest,  
 And rudely shook the half-formed nest.  
 Gay clamoring, on the light air borne,  
 I heard the flight arrive at morn,  
 While moaning winds were surging loud,  
 And chilling showers the dawn-light cloud ;  
 E'er the low sun had drank the dew,  
 Or sleep-closed flowers their bloom renew.  
 Say ! from what distant lands ye come,  
 To claim with us your annual home ?  
 And weave anew, in hope still blest,  
 The old hereditary nest ?  
 Ah ! not for me, returning Spring  
 Shall here your busy numbers bring :  
 Ah ! not for me again to trace  
 The wiles of your sagacious race,  
 To watch your toils, and, day by day,  
 Idly, your busy work survey ;  
 To see you on the lawn alight,  
 Or, wheeling, soar in rapid flight,  
 Intent some ponderous branch to tear  
 From yon old willow, crisp and bare,  
 Or from some pilfering neighbour wrest  
 The mossy spoil that lined his nest.

' Though *here* no more the household hearth  
 Shall echo to *my* children's mirth,  
 No more, calm-floating on the breeze,  
 Its blue smoke curl above these trees,  
 (While its bright blaze reflected shone  
 On all I loved to call my own,)  
 Though dim the halls, the chambers closed,  
 Where social love and peace reposed,  
 Though from the barred and silent gate  
 No welcome I again await,—  
 Oh ! ever may its green domain  
 A safe retreat for *you* contain—  
 Unharm'd, and joyous may ye soar,  
 Though I shall see your haunts no more !'

pp. 15-18.

Next to the piece from which we have taken the above extracts, is placed a collection of shorter poems, entitled *Fragments*. They are mostly imitations from the German, Spanish, Italian, &c., and are marked by the same smooth and flowing diction, and, if we may use the phrase, feminine senti-



ment, which appear in the longer poem. From among these Fragments we shall take, as a specimen, the following original Lines to the Miniature Picture of a Child. The miniature represents the boy 'as having just closed the little volume, from which he had been repeating his prayers.'

'Long years have passed, yet still while here I bend,  
Fast flow the tears that weep thy early doom;  
Still on my soul the secret sorrow preys  
That mourns thee low in thy untimely tomb.

'Oh! best beloved! (was ought on earth more dear?)  
Is this, alas! all that remains of thee?  
Dim through my tears the lovely image smiles,  
Still, as in life, from care and sorrow free.

'Blest be the hand which thus with sacred skill,  
This cherished idol to my heart has given;  
Rescued from time and death that cheek's soft bloom,  
And shewn the lost on earth, preserved in heaven—

'Such as erewhile, in childhood's blissful hour  
I saw him sporting on that flower-strewn sod,  
Nor knew the whirlwind fate was on the wing,  
Which instant summoned him, to meet his God.

'(Ah! who so bright, so pure, so fit to die,  
By brief transition to that heaven to rise,  
Which bade him bless me for some few short years,  
Then swift recalled him to his native skies!)

'The same soft radiance gilds that amber hair,  
The same bright smile in those blue eyes I see!  
—Angel of heaven! still breathe thy artless prayer;  
Oh! intercede for her who mourns for thee!

'For her, who, rich in every earthly joy,  
Still heaves for thee the secret lingering sigh,  
Still mourns her fair-haired, blooming, darling boy,  
Born but to smile and bless her—and to die.

'If here, while kneeling at my feet, thy prayer  
In daily incense did to heaven ascend,  
Still for thy mother feel an angel's care,  
Still o'er her fate a seraph's guard extend.

‘ When dangers threaten, or when sorrows try,  
 To shield, to save her, to thy charge be given !  
 On hovering wing receive her parting sigh,  
 Guide her freed soul, and welcome her to heaven !’  
 pp. 144-147.

- 
- ART. V.—1. *A Sermon, occasioned by the Death of Thomas Hollis, Esq.* By JEREMIAH HUNT. London. 1731.
2. *A Sermon preached at the Lecture in Boston, April 1, 1731, before His Excellency, the Governor, and the General Court; upon the News of the Death of the much honored Thomas Hollis, Esq., the most generous and noble Patron of Learning and Religion in the Churches of New England.* By his Friend and Correspondent, BENJAMIN COLMAN. Boston. 1731.
3. *A Sermon preached at the Public Lecture, Tuesday, April 6, 1731, in the Hall of Harvard College, in Cambridge, N. E., upon the News of the Death of Thomas Hollis, Esq. of London, the most bountiful Benefactor to that Society.* By EDWARD WIGGLESWORTH, D. D. and Hollis Professor of Divinity. Boston. 1731.
4. *A Philosophical Discourse concerning the Mutability and Changes of the Material World; read to the Students of Harvard College, April 7, 1731, upon the News of the Death of Thomas Hollis, Esq. of London, the most bountiful Benefactor to that Society.* By ISAAC GREENWOOD, A. M. Hollisian Professor of Philosophy and the Mathematics. Boston. 1731.
5. *A Poem on the Death of the late Thomas Hollis, Esq.* By SAYER RUDD. London. 1731.

It is due to the memory of an early and distinguished patron of learning in this country, to collect and put on record such historical notices as remain of his life, character, and benefactions. This is the more necessary in the case of Thomas Hollis, as a controversy has been repeatedly started respecting his real intentions in regard to one of the most considerable of his donations, and it is high time that the questions, to which this controversy has given rise, should be put at rest.

His father, of the same name, was of Rotherham, in the county of York, a whitesmith by trade, and the founder of the hospital at Sheffield, for the maintenance of sixteen poor cutlers' widows; an excellent charity, which was afterwards much improved by his descendants.\* During the civil wars, he left Yorkshire, and settled with his family in London; and in the year 1679 took a lease for ninety-nine years of Pinners' Hall, formerly the place of meeting of the principal Independents, Oliver Cromwell and others. He was of the Baptist persuasion, and died in London in the year 1718, at the advanced age of eighty-four, leaving three sons, Thomas, Nathaniel, and John, and one daughter, Mary.† Of the daughter we know nothing, but we find that the sons were often joint contributors to the same charities, and John, particularly, as well as Thomas, was a considerable benefactor to Harvard College. It is remarkable of this family from the beginning, that they commonly gave what they had to bestow on public objects while living; that they lived frugally, to have the means of giving more largely; that they gave without ostentation, and did not confine their gifts to a party. As far as they can be traced back, they appear to have been firm and consistent Dissenters, caring but little comparatively for the differences among the Dissenters themselves, and showing on all occasions a warm attachment to the cause of civil and religious liberty. They were not related in any way, as was once supposed, to Denzil Lord Hollis, who distinguished himself so much on the parliament side in the civil wars; but, as one of them said, they were full of his spirit.

\* Other charities are also mentioned in the following extract from the funeral discourse pronounced at his death.—'He delayed not doing good to his death; but during his life cast about how he might be serviceable to his relations, and, in a particular manner, to the ministers of Christ, wherein he greatly abounded. His charity was not confined to a party, though it might extend more to those who were of his own persuasion, being sincere, and thinking himself in the right. He denied himself and lived frugal, that he might more extensively express his goodness. Various methods he took to be publicly useful; distributing books proper to encourage religion and virtue; promoting schools for instruction of the poor to read and write, and contributing to the building of places of worship. He erected and founded two churches at Rotherham and Doncaster, and established schools at each place for teaching youth; not only communicating in his life to their maintenance, but bequeathing some encouragement after his decease.' A Funeral Sermon occasioned by the Death of Mr Thomas Hollis. Preached Sept. 14, 1718. By Jeremiah Hunt. pp. 32, 33.

† *Memoirs of Thomas Hollis, Esq.*, vol. i. p. 1.

VOL. VII.—N. S. VOL. II NO. I.

Thomas Hollis, the subject of this memoir, was born in London, in 1659. At ten years of age he had the small pox severely, and was led to form many serious resolutions as to his future conduct, if God should spare his life, which, however, do not appear, by his own confession, to have had much influence on him after his recovery. Five years after this he was sent to France, where he resided for some time in a sober family of Huguenots at Rouen, and acquired a competent knowledge of the French language and literature. He visited that country again on business for his father in 1676, and was exposed, as he says, to sore temptations, which it required great resolution to overcome, aided as he was by the religious principles in which he had been educated. Uncommon care appears to have been bestowed on his religious training from childhood, and we cannot wonder, therefore, that, as he grew up, he imbibed and adopted the peculiar opinions, as well as the generous and catholic spirit of the family. At the age of seventeen he was baptized, and in the following year admitted to the church by Anthony Palmer, then minister at Pinners' Hall.

In 1680, he commenced business for himself, in the Minories, as a hardware merchant, and subsequently, it seems, took into partnership his brother John. He married in 1683, a daughter of Mr Legay, a reputable London merchant; and the connexion, though unblessed with offspring, appears to have been uncommonly happy. He refers to her again and again, in his correspondence, in terms of great affection and respect, and mentions her death, which took place in 1724, with the fixed and desolate sorrow of a broken-hearted old man.\* Accord-

\* The following is the character which Dr Hunt gives of this excellent woman.—'She was careful to perform constantly prayer in her closet, and with great seriousness joined in with family devotion and public worship. The respect she was early instructed to pay to the ministers of the gospel, for their works sake, did not prevent her from using her own judgment, which always gave the preference to such who informed the mind, and imparted light, rather than to those who only or chiefly addressed to the passions. In her later years she read pretty much, principally the sacred scriptures, to which she paid the highest deference, and some devotional pieces.

'By these means of religion, she had attained great meekness and humility, and a calm and peaceable disposition. For which reason, when the messengers of peace discovered in their discourses any degree of a temper contrary to their character, she expressed a great concern. And if he *who offends not in word, is a perfect man*, she had as just a claim to that character as any I ever knew. When she met with unkind or injurious treatment, it was her way to refer the affair to God, and would recommend to others the same conduct, from the experience she had had of kind interpositions of Providence. She would sometimes express her grief, that among good Christians there should be



ing to his own account he was never very rich, and he also intimates that he suffered considerably in the South Sea Scheme, and other speculations, which proved so disastrous to English capitalists at the beginning of the last century. Still, as his habits were not expensive, and as he had no children to educate and establish in life, he was able, some time before his first letter to Dr Colman in 1720, to retire from business with a fortune ample enough for his necessities, for a generous hospitality, and for numerous and extensive charities, such as have been equalled by few persons in the same condition.

Pinner's Hall was leased originally, as we have said, to Mr Hollis's father, and we find that the whole family, considerable alike for wealth and character, continued to worship there, and together constituted such an amount of influence, that no important measure was likely to be carried in the society, which they did not propose or favor. Mr Hollis himself, also, was one of the deacons of the church from 1700; another circumstance which must have given him not a little authority and control over everything that was done by the church or congregation. In this state of things, Jeremiah Hunt was called to be their pastor. This gentleman was one of the most learned divines of his day, having pursued his preparatory and professional studies with great assiduity, first at London, then at Edinburgh, and afterwards at Leyden, under the celebrated Frederic Spanheim and Perizonius. His preaching was for the most part expository, in which he went over the New Testament, and some of the Old, in order, explaining everything according to the best of his judgment, and never attempting to conceal or disguise what he thought to be truth, for fear of offending his hearers. He preached without notes, but his memory and method were so good, that he seldom, if ever, forgot his discourses, which were always carefully premeditated. One instance in particular is given, in which, at half an hour's notice, he repeated a sermon he had delivered fourteen years before, without missing, as was believed, three sentences. He was an intimate friend and a relative of Lardner, who preached his funeral discourse, and sums up his

so little discoursing of religion; though she never approved of an unseasonable introduction of such conversation, or a weak management of it. The highest pleasure that I ever observed her to discover, was when she had done some good office to another; and how beneficent and charitable she was, many will be sensible of by the loss of her.'—*Sermon on the Death of Mrs Hollis*, pp. 36, 37.

character in these words. 'Upon the whole, I always esteemed Dr Hunt as useful a minister as any in his time; which opinion has been as much founded upon the usefulness of his conversation, as of his preaching and writing.'\*

The doctrines inculcated by Dr Hunt were decidedly opposed, not only to essential parts of Calvinism, but to all Orthodox explications of the trinity, as the following extracts from his Sermons will show. In a discourse on the Righteousness of God, he says;—

'To imagine "that God will impute the act of one person to another; or that, by the act of one man, all his race should be rendered utterly incapable of determining, or acting, as moral agents;" and to say "that God has not lost his commanding power, though we have lost our ability to obey;" appears to be a way of discoursing, that cannot be, in the least, reconcilable to the attribute of God's righteousness.

\* We copy an interesting passage, in this connexion, from Wilson's History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches, vol. ii. pp. 268, 269.—'Dr Hunt entertained a great contempt for the whole body of infidels, who pretend to condemn revelation, without ever having carefully studied and considered it. Notwithstanding the airs of superior importance, which they are apt to give themselves, he looked upon them as a sort of men, who have only a very superficial knowledge both of scripture and antiquity. To this ignorance, he partly ascribed their infidelity. As Dr Hunt was the intimate friend of Lord Barrington, who was a member of his church, he frequently visited his lordship at his seat, at Tofts, in Essex; where he sometimes met with Mr Anthony Collins, the celebrated Free-Thinker. As they were all men of letters, and had a taste for scripture-criticism, it is said to have been their custom, after dinner, to have a Greek Testament laid upon the table. In one of these conversations, Mr Collins observed, that he had a very great respect for the memory of the apostle Paul; and added, "I think so well of him, who was both a man of sense, and a gentleman, that if he had asserted he had worked miracles himself, I would have believed him." Lord Barrington immediately produced a passage in which that apostle asserts his having wrought miracles. Mr Collins seemed somewhat disconcerted; and soon after took his hat, and quitted the company. When Lord Barrington, in another conversation, asked Mr Collins what was the reason that, though he seemed himself to have very little religion, he yet took great care that his servants should attend regularly at church, his reply was, that "he did this to prevent their robbing or murdering him." Dr Hunt had a strong persuasion that the succeeding age would be as remarkable for enthusiasm, as his own was for infidelity; inasmuch as the two extremes mutually produce, or occasion each other. "His prediction (observes a late writer) hath already, in some degree, been accomplished. Enthusiasm hath strongly seized a part of the people, while infidelity has prevailed among others, so that betwixt them both, rational religion has suffered not a little. But let not her friends be discouraged; for in the due order of Providence, she will, I doubt not, revive with fresh lustre and beauty, and at length draw all men after her.'"

“That God gives us a law, which we are not capable of seeing to be right and fit, and such as arises from our make, and tends to the perfection and happiness of it; or that we should not, by his assistance and with his aid, be capable of complying with it;” is to suppose that God does not deal with his creatures, upon the foot of equity and justice. And, in consequence, this must be a wrong sentiment of God.—Hunt’s Sermons, Vol. I. pp. 237, 238.

Again, in a discourse on the Goodness of God he exclaims;—

‘How inconsistent to this notion of beneficence, is that astonishing doctrine of reprobation!’

‘How it came into the world, is not worth examining; but, sure it is, that there is nothing can be more opposite and repugnant to the nature of this attribute of God, than that doctrine. If any should say, “that God may express particular favor to some, more than to others;” this cannot be denied; provided, that they do not refer to such instances of his goodness, as shall interfere with our character as agents. But that he should, from eternity, determine the greatest part of his reasonable creatures, in this structure and frame of things, to everlasting misery, without any regard to a moral character, or the reverse, is no way congruous, or agreeable to the idea of God, who determines unchangeably to be good and beneficent to all his creatures, in a way consistent with wisdom and a perfect moral government.

‘But the doctrine of reprobation supposes the greater part of men, from the determination of God, before their existence, to be sentenced to endless torment; and that without any regard to their moral character; only to gratify the severity of his justice. Surely, no one but must easily discern that this is quite repugnant to this attribute of God; i. e. perfect goodness.’—Id. pp. 263, 264.

Once more, in a sermon on the Majesty, Glory, and Sovereignty of God, he observes;—

‘Some have run into surprising mistakes upon this head. They have imagined that God, as a sovereign, may do what he will with his creatures; that there is nothing inconsistent in supposing, that, upon this character, he can decree misery to his innocent creatures, beyond the value of their being; and that he can, for the sin of another, damn a great part of mankind, and make them unhappy forever. For he is a sovereign; and what proportion is there between him and us? May not he do with his creatures, as he pleases? Do we find fault with any in

our make, for killing a fly? Now, there is much greater disproportion between God and us, than there is between us and a fly. They, therefore, think that he may, as a sovereign, absolutely decree, and, in the course of his dominion, inflict, great distress and misery, and that upon the much greater part of his reasonable creatures, without any imputation upon his justice, wisdom, or goodness.'—Hunt's Sermons, Vol. II. pp. 112, 113.

So far from consenting in such views, he says a little further on;—

'We cannot conceive, that, when goodness induced him to give being, he should make that being worth nothing; nay, worse than nothing. For who would not prefer non-existence, to existing only as a foundation of all conceivable misery? To imagine that God, as a sovereign, should lay schemes to make the greatest part of his rational creation miserable forever, is to paint Deity in the most hideous and dreadful manner. We can never entertain such a notion of the power, or dominion of God. He cannot tempt any, neither can he be tempted. And to imagine that this sovereign, in the exercise of his moral government, should, in an irresistible manner, operate upon some, to bring them to a temper of happiness, and to design everlasting misery to the greater number, is to describe Deity in the most formidable view.'—Id. p. 115.

To a proper Calvinist a hundred years ago, all this must have sounded like the rankest heresy. The following extract from a sermon on the Unity of God, shows, also, that Dr Hunt had abandoned the popular notion of a trinity.

'However, since there is but one true God, and he the object of supreme worship, we may easily see the absurdity of a plurality of Gods, and of paying that homage to a variety of objects, which is due only to the supreme.

'And, if we take in a subordinate worship, yet, under the light of nature, or law of reason, there was nothing of this settled. And therefore it was altogether without ground. But now it is settled by revelation, let us keep close to the divine appointment.

'When we worship Christ, let us remember, that that worship should be terminated in the Father. For we worship Christ, as the son; as the lamb slain and put to death, and designed to be so, before the ages began to roll.

'As long as we keep close to the divine appointment, there is no reason to accuse us of idolatry; nor can such a charge be fixed upon us. For we worship the Father, by the son, and



through the spirit. And, when there is, in scripture, any instance of worship paid to the son, it is paid to him as the lamb of God, as the sent of the Father, and so ultimately paid to God.'

Hunt's Sermons, Vol. II. pp. 69, 70.

These were the religious opinions of the man whom Mr Hollis, after hearing him preach about fifteen years, calls 'a learned man, and a critical and just expositor of the holy scriptures.' As the ministers at Pinners' Hall, up to this time, had been strictly Calvinistic, we cannot wonder that the introduction of one of such different sentiments, occasioned a schism between the strictly Calvinistic members of the society, and the Liberal. Mr Hollis took sides warmly with the latter, as appears from his own account of the difficulty, in a letter to Dr Colman, just quoted.

'About 1707, Mr Jeremiah Hunt was chosen pastor, and by the grace of God, we continue our church state, and meet in the same place, through good report, and evil surmises. Our numbers have been small, some years, but we have walked in love, till lately some few have been made uneasy by a hot zeal without knowledge. Yet I hope shortly the innocency of the upright shall be manifested, and the slanderers be ashamed.'

It is remarkable, also, that not an expression escapes him, throughout his whole correspondence, implying the slightest distrust as to the soundness of Dr Hunt's views. On the contrary, he always speaks of him, not only as his minister, but as his confidential friend and adviser on all occasions, and particularly in regard to his religious charities, and the conditions on which they should be given.

The next important transaction, in which Mr Hollis took an active part, was the celebrated Salters' Hall controversy. The Dissenters had always complained of it, from the first, as an intolerable grievance, that the national church sought to impose on the conscience, human formularies of faith and worship. For some time, therefore, few among them could muster effrontery enough to recommend the adoption of the obnoxious principle in their own body, so that the minds of both ministers and people were left in a great measure free. Now it has always followed, we believe without a single exception, that wherever the minds of men have been left free to the simple teachings of scripture, they have gradually tended toward some form of Unitarianism; as in Geneva, in some parts of Germany, among the Irish Presbyterians, and the Congregationalists in this vicin-

ity. This tendency was obstructed for many years, in the case of the English Dissenters, partly by a strong Calvinistic bias, which they took as soon as Laud, and others of the High Church party, declared for Arminianism, and partly by the oppressions they underwent from the government, which left them neither time nor heart for any controversies but those that turned on their condition as Nonconformists, and made it madness for them to divide and destroy the little strength they had as a party, by dissensions among themselves. On the accession of the House of Hanover, juster principles of toleration began to prevail. Men began to think; and the consequence was, that the most intelligent and best educated among the Dissenting ministers soon began to observe an ominous silence in regard to the trinity, and other kindred doctrines. James Peirce of Exeter, who appears to have been a man of uncommon seriousness and piety from childhood, and had studied with great success at the foreign universities, was among the first to betray, in this quiet and unobtrusive manner, his dissatisfaction with the popular faith. This was provocation enough for the bigots, and such as wished to gain a reputation as champions of Orthodoxy, to sound an alarm in the churches, and put into circulation a thousand calumnies and vague surmises against him, alike inconsistent and unfounded. Some would have it, that he was a Jesuit in disguise, fresh from St Omers; others that he was probably a Deist, perhaps an Atheist, at heart, and merely pretended a respect for the scriptures, and the forms of Christianity, that he might have a better opportunity to insinuate his infidel principles. Others were content to call him an Arian; a term, which, like Socinian afterwards, and Unitarian now, conveyed no distinct idea to the Orthodox generally, but only that he was a monster. Many of Mr Peirce's neighbours and friends, who were known to speculate with him, were involved, of course, in the same condemnation, and a controversy arose, which led, as is usual in such cases, to mutual recriminations, and threatened a wide, lasting, and fatal schism. So great was the scandal, that one of the judges in the Western Circuit took notice of it, in his charges to the grand juries, as a matter of which they were to make inquest, a denial of the trinity being then accounted felony by the English law.\*

\* One or two extracts from pamphlets published in the Arian Controversy, as it has been called, will help our readers to form some notion of the temper

In this state of things, a Committee of the Three Denominations, with Lord Barrington at their head, drew up a 'Paper of Advices,' with a view, it would seem, to restore peace. These gentlemen recommended,

'1. That we should all of us, according to our several capacities and opportunities, and in a more especial manner those that are ministers of the Gospel of Peace, endeavour to allay all unreasonable jealousies concerning the sentiments and opinions of others, particularly ministers. That the christian principles of charity, and mutual forbearance should be promoted. That an intemperate degree of zeal in judging of the Christianity and sincerity of their brethren should be avoided; and that peace and love, which are the great characteristics of Christians, be as much as is possible obtained.

'2. If this method shall not be found effectual, but notwithstanding some Christians shall accuse others, or their own ministers, as not holding the christian faith, or as propagating opinions, which they conceive to be inconsistent with it; that no such accusation should be in the least regarded by ministers

in which religious discussions were conducted in those days. The following is from a pious effusion, without a name, bearing this title;—'Blasphemia Detestanda; or, a Caution against the Diabolism of Arius: a Letter from a Clergyman of the Country to his Brother in the City of Exon, touching the vile and wretched Arians, said to be starting up there.' It begins thus;—'My Dear Brother, it strikes me to the heart, to hear that any one man of your good city of Exon should be weary of the Catholic Faith; and that there should any man be found in it, that should be but so much as tempted to the wretched heresy of that base and vile miscreant Arius, whose bowels, like Judas, gushed out.'—'Whilst Romans ix. 5. stares them in the face, they must be conscious, and are so, very conscious; and, though shameless, yet full of secret shame, guilt, and misgivings. For besides scripture, all the determinations of Fathers, Councils, and Creeds, are against them, in all ages of Christianity. But, to their diabolical and hellish shame, I am told, they have the daring impudence and infidelity to pish away all these.'

Thomas Bradbury, the leader of the Exclusionists, was not ashamed to put his name to the following passage in a letter to Lord Barrington;—'I begin with that witty author the writer of the Synod, and shall very soon have done with him; for several of the ministers whom he admires for their generous management, p. 6, did openly call him a rascal, and a villain. "He saith, he loves to be free *in* his faith," which may be true enough for ought I know, for he is not very free *of* it; and it would be hard upon him to believe what everybody else does; for if his faith runs in the common stream, he must believe himself to be a coxcomb. Just as much a wit as he is a Christian; one whose pen is as great a prostitute as the press from whence his book came, that is fit to publish any error, and any scandal. He is very fawning on a truly Reverend Prelate, and then on you, whom in his accurate way, he calls a Lay-Gentleman, lest any one should take you for a Clergy-Gentleman. But I pity both the bishop and yourself, that you lie under the dirt of his commendations. For, if you do but consider where he throws his

or others, to whom application shall be made for advice on such occasions, unless two or more persons shall subscribe their names to such accusation, as plainly and openly accusing, and being ready to support and justify such accusation. That by this means all private insinuations, tending to give scandal, may be avoided, and proceedings may be had in that open and sincere way which the gospel prescribes.

'3. That when there is a proper accusation made, and duly supported as aforesaid, the person accused should be first privately admonished, before the matter be brought under the examination of any public assembly, or the person accused put under the necessity of publicly defending himself.

'4. If at last any shall be called to so difficult a work as that of judging the faith of their brethren, and determining their title to the name of Christians, their capacity of being members of christian churches, and their hopes of salvation, we assure ourselves they will, in a matter of so great moment, adhere steadfastly to the Protestant principle; will make use of no human decisions, human forms, or compositions either to torture or condemn their christian brethren. That they will think nothing but the plain and express declarations of holy scripture, a sufficient authority to justify their condemning any, as not holding the faith necessary to salvation; and that in so awful a

contempt, you will wonder that he should admire anything that is not scandalous; and I fear, people that read him will be ready to ask, what my Lord of Bangor and Mr Barrington have done against Christianity, to deserve the flatteries of a stupid Atheist?'—Answer to the Reproaches cast on the Dissenting Ministers, &c. pp. 4, 5.

A single extract will suffice as a specimen of the humor, with which the Orthodox were sometimes met by the other party. It is taken from the preface to an answer to a feeble, but very popular tract in defence of the trinity;—'The sheet I have undertaken to correct, has given many men or women, I do not doubt, a great deal of pleasure, (for it had passed seven editions before I read it,) and never gave anybody any pain. But that is no argument, it was not capable of doing any mischief, however innocent the author may be. If a man offers at argument, without reviling, let it be as weak as it will, since there are others, as weak as the author, who may fancy it is all gospel, because they see so many proofs, as they use to call chapter and verse, how miserably soever mistaken, and how widely soever applied, I cannot think it altogether needless to bestow an answer on him; for if his performance does not deserve one, it may, however, need it.

'Everything except truth contributed to make it spread; viz. The price, which was but 12s. an hundred; the number of Arguments, no less than fifty, enough for the money, if people had any conscience, supposing they had no judgment; and the multitude of those to whom they were adapted.

'I am too well acquainted with the vulgar, who only can need any help to answer such arguments as these, to expect so fair a hearing; for I know there are seven who would lay out 2d. in fifty arguments, to prove what they are resolved never to doubt of, to one who will lay out 6d. when he knows it is only to see himself confuted.'—Plain and full Answer to an Anonymous Pamphlet, &c. Preface.



case as judging the servants of our common Lord and Master they will, we doubt not, act as those who expect his apperance.<sup>2</sup>

The Arians asked no more than was here conceded, and for this reason the paper was opposed by some in the Committee, but was finally passed. To give it more influence and authority, it was submitted for the approbation of the whole body of Dissenting ministers, in and about London, convened for that purpose at Salters' Hall, February 19, 1719. The Exclusionists objected to the Advices altogether; but this did not prevent the meeting from proceeding to take up the consideration of them, article by article. At an adjournment, February 24, some of the more violent among the Orthodox interrupted the regular business by moving that there should be introduced in some part of the Advices, 'a declaration of faith in the holy trinity.' A warm debate ensued, and when the question was taken, fiftythree voted in the affirmative, and fiftyseven in the negative. The Liberal party triumphed in the first convocation or assembly of divines, since the times of the apostles, it was said, which had carried a question for liberty.

The part which Mr Hollis took in this controversy, and his opinion of the conduct of those concerned in it, we shall give in his own words, in a letter to Dr Colman, dated March 1, 1721.

'I send you herewith Dr Mather's\* letters, which have been made use of to continue our divisions. I presume to think that he has not had a true state of our Salters' Hall differences, else he would not suggest such things therein contained against his brethren, who love the Lord Jesus, and him for Christ's sake—so contrary to that Catholic charity he expressed in the printed sermon preached at Mr Callender's ordination. I thought Mr Watts and Mr Neal, the former [latter?] of which lived nine or ten years in my family, by their letters had set things in a better light. I do heartily forgive him, so far as I am concerned. I own myself to have been one of the Committee, called of the Three Denominations, who met many times about drawing up the Paper of Advices to our friends at Exeter for peace, and I cannot yet see reason to repent any paragraph therein contained; though I own, when it was near finished, from the carriage of a few in the Committee, I moved and urged it should

\* Dr Cotton Mather, of Boston, to whom the whole affair had been misrepresented, probably by two of the most active among the disorganizers, Walrond and Bradbury, with whom he is understood to have corresponded.

be dropped, and not sent to Salters' Hall, fearing divisions from the temper of a few ; which indeed fell out so, greatly exceeding my fears. I believe all the gentlemen concerned in signing the letter, of whom I was one of the meanest in character, were very far from any plot against the honor of our Lord Jesus, whom we believe God over all blessed forever. But if it must be called a plot, it was to restrain a few overheated zealots from too much censuring their brethren. And to look back, I think had there not been a majority against subscribing the roll at Salters' Hall, at that time, such a test would have run through all the churches in England by this time, which would have endangered many schisms, and silenced many useful preachers ; and I rejoice their plot did not succeed.'

In politics Mr Hollis, with the Dissenters generally, was a stanch Whig. The only family of much consideration in public life, with which he appears to have associated on terms of intimacy, was that of the Shutes, and particularly with John, the youngest brother, afterwards created Viscount Lord Barington, who seems to have been his oracle on all occasions, and he could hardly have had a better. Swift gives the following character of him, writing in 1708 to Archbishop King ;— 'One Mr Shute is named for secretary to Lord Wharton. He is a young man, but reckoned the shrewdest head in England, and the person in whom the Presbyterians chiefly confide ; and if money be necessary towards the good work,\* it is reckoned he can command as far as one hundred thousand pounds from the body of the Dissenters here. As to his principles, he is a moderate man, frequenting the Church and the Meeting indifferently.' He first distinguished himself at the age of twentyfour, by important services rendered the Whig ministry of Anne in bringing over the Scotch Presbyterians to favor the projected union of the two kingdoms. All his prospects of advancement, however, were soon blasted by the disastrous change in the administration, which brought the Tories into power. The black and portentous cloud which hung over the interests of civil and religious liberty, and the Protestant succession, during the last years of this misguided queen, was broken and dispersed by her death, August 1, 1714, the very day on which the Schism Bill, one of the most unrighteous and oppressive acts passed against the Dissenters, was to go

\* Probably the repeal of the Sacramental Tests.

into effect.\* At the accession of George I. the Whigs were on their feet again, and Mr Shute came in for his share of honors and responsibilities, and in 1720 was created Baron Barrington, of Newcastle, and Viscount Barrington, of Ardglass. His expulsion from the House of Commons, in 1723, in consequence of his connexion with the Harburgh Company, as sub-governor under the Prince of Wales, is no reflection on his character, as it was clearly an act of violence and injustice, into which the House was hurried by the public exasperation at the bursting of one of the bubbles of the day.

Lord Barrington was accounted one of the best informed theologians of his time; and not without reason, as is proved by his principal work, *Miscellanea Sacra*, which is said to have shaken the infidelity of Anthony Collins. The great excellence of his writings, however, consists in the noble spirit of liberty which they everywhere breathe, and in the able and earnest

\* We shall be excused for throwing into a note a passage on this subject, taken from a work seldom met with in this country, as it illustrates strikingly the state of feeling among the Dissenters at that time. We have had occasion to mention Mr Bradbury more than once, and never in very favorable terms. Here he appears in a character somewhat different;—‘The gloomy state of public affairs, in consequence of the intrigues that were carried on in favor of the Pretender, excited in all true Protestants the most dismal apprehensions for the safety of the nation, when to their unspeakable joy, the storm suddenly blew over by the death of the queen, after a short illness, on Sunday, August the 1st, 1714. On that very morning, as we are informed, while Mr Bradbury was walking along Smithfield, in a pensive condition, Bishop Burnet happened to pass through in his carriage; and observing his friend, called out to him by name, and inquired the cause of his great thoughtfulness. “I am thinking,” replies Mr Bradbury, “whether I shall have the constancy and resolution of that noble company of martyrs, whose ashes are deposited in this place; for I most assuredly expect to see similar times of violence and persecution, and that I shall be called to suffer in a like cause.” The bishop, who was himself equally zealous in the Protestant cause, endeavoured to quiet his fears; told him that the queen was very ill; that she was given over by her physicians, who expected every hour to be her last; and that he was then going to the court to inform himself as to the exact particulars. He moreover assured Mr Bradbury that he would dispatch a messenger to him with the earliest intelligence of the Queen’s death; and that if he should happen to be in the pulpit when the messenger arrived, he should be instructed to drop a handkerchief from the gallery, as a token of that event. It so happened that the queen died while Mr Bradbury was preaching, and the intelligence was communicated to him by the signal agreed upon. It need hardly be mentioned what joy the news gave him. He, however, suppressed his feelings during the sermon; but in his last prayer returned thanks to God for the deliverance of these kingdoms from the evil counsels and designs of their enemies, and implored the Divine blessing upon his majesty, King George, and the House of Hanover. He then gave out the 89th psalm, from Patrick’s collection, which was strikingly appropriate to the occasion. Mr Bradbury ever afterwards gloried in being the first man who proclaimed King George the First.’—Wilson’s Dissenting Churches, vol. iii. pp. 512–514.

defences they contain of free inquiry, and in the indignation they express against all attempts to restrain it, whether by the civil magistrate, ecclesiastics, or the mob. He was the acknowledged head of the Liberal party in the Salters' Hall controversy; and the Paper of Advices, most of which has been inserted above, is understood to have been from his pen, written with a view to skreen the Arians and Sabellians. He is also understood to have been the author of one or two other anonymous publications at the time, which gave great offence to the strictly Orthodox. For some time he attended Mr Bradbury's preaching at Fetter Lane, but left him at last, being disgusted with his exclusiveness and bigotry on the doctrine of the trinity, and became a hearer of Dr Hunt.

Mr Hollis's connexion and intimacy with this nobleman supposes him to have held the same liberal sentiments, and must have strengthened and confirmed him in these sentiments. The interest he felt in the whole family, led him, also, to espouse warmly the cause of Lord Barrington's brother, Governor Shute, in his misunderstandings with the House of Representatives at Boston, and the Province generally. The administration of this gentleman was inauspicious and stormy from first to last, and the condition and prospects of the Province were never more truly deplorable. Menaced on the frontier by the Indians, vexed and torn by civil dissensions, the currency depreciated to less than one half its nominal value, many of the new settlements breaking up and falling in, and all these causes conspiring to ruin trade and deprave the morals of the people—this was the melancholy state of affairs from 1716, when Colonel Shute assumed the reins of government, to 1723, when he suddenly quitted the country in disgust, and went home to England to make known his grievances, and obtain redress, and return with new powers. He never returned, though it appears from Mr Hollis's letters, that about four years afterwards he was on the eve of doing it, and had proceeded so far as to send over a part of his furniture. The following extract of a letter, which Mr Hollis wrote to Dr Colman, March 1, 1727, expresses the opinions entertained by him, Mr Neal, and other friends of New England, in the mother country;—

‘The occasion of my present letter, is to acquaint you that your governor, Col. Shute, did me the honor of a visit yesterday,



and dined with me. He expresses his purpose and resolution of returning to his government this summer, with King George's letter of instructions, and recommending of him to your Council and Assembly, to allow him a suitable provision for to maintain the expenses of his post; not less than one thousand pounds sterling per annum, and your paper credit valued to him at the price the merchants fix the course of exchange.

'I know he has a great opinion of your sincerity and affections to serve him, and will listen to your advice. Suffer me to offer my thoughts in the affair. Do you counsel him on his arrival as the old men did Rehoboam, 1 Kings, xii. 7, and I wish he may take the advice. He has been banished, as it were, from you, about four years, and many uneasy resentments have filled his mind, from Cooke and some others, together with but mean circumstances for a gentleman wearing such a commission. If your rulers receive him returning in love, and carry it with respect due to the governor, and duty to King George, you will be the happiest people of any of his Majesty's colonies or islands in America. But if you disregard the king's letter, and treat him unkindly, as they formerly did, I cannot answer for consequences; but I believe your children, not to say the gentlemen now in power, will hereafter repent it.

'Pray do not expose my letter to public talk. If you can make any good use of the caution for good to the community, do it. It is amazing to some of us here, when we think New England the richest and most numerous people of the American provinces the English possess, yet should maintain their governor in the meanest manner of them all.'

The hostility to the governor was grounded on the demand which he made, according to his instructions, for a fixed and independent support. This the House of Representatives did right to refuse, but there was no excuse for continuing to grant him only the same nominal sum of one thousand pounds *per annum*, after the depreciation in the currency had reduced this in value to three hundred and sixty pounds sterling, certainly a mean and inadequate provision. The younger Cooke, alluded to in the letter, was one of the most active and implacable of the governor's opponents, and followed him to England, to fight out the battle there, as the agent of the Province. While in London he had several interviews with Mr Hollis, though, as might be expected, it was not with much cordiality on either side; but the account we have of their conversation at one of these meetings is interesting, as it shows, that even then, the

question had been started respecting the non-residence of the College Corporation. Mr Hollis writes ;—

‘ Mr Cooke, your agent, and his son, did me the honor to visit me at my house last week, and we discoursed of your state, and of your College. He tells me that your College is in a very bad state and condition ; and the Corporation ought to be of resident Fellows ; that the gentlemen non-resident are as worthy persons as the country affords, or could be chosen, but by their living at a distance cannot attend the good of the House as were to be desired ; and you cannot alter it, or increase the number of your Corporation without hazard of the whole ; that the wisest men in Boston had thoroughly examined it, and himself also, who seems to understand your constitution very well.’

The charities, public and private, in which Mr Hollis abounded, give him his principal claims on our notice and respect. He distributed largely among the poor in his neighbourhood, in the distress occasioned by a succession of severe winters. He made frequent and liberal donations to the Dissenting churches in England and Wales, especially, though not exclusively, to those of his own persuasion. Several young men of promise and sobriety among the Baptists, who afterwards became eminent, were indebted to him for the means of an education on the continent, the universities at home being barred against them. He contributed his full proportion to build up the Sheffield hospital, an institution already mentioned as founded and endowed by the family. He was also active and liberal in his aid of the societies for the propagation of the gospel in the Highlands, and in this country. We have just adverted to these charities, because they ought to be considered in making up an estimate of the character of Hollis ; but our attention is called more particularly to what he did for Harvard College.

It appears that Robert Thorner left several legacies for charitable purposes, and among the rest one for Harvard College, and appointed his nephew, Mr Hollis, one of the trustees. When Dr Increase Mather and his son were in London in 1690, Mr Hollis gave them a minute of his uncle’s will, but told them that it would be many years before the bequest would become due, and intimated that they might possibly hear from him sooner. His first letter bears date March 2, 1719, and is addressed ‘ To Mr Increase Mather, formerly President of Harvard College, or to the Gentleman who is now President thereof.’ It contained an invoice of twelve casks of nails and one cask of

cutlery, consigned to John Gilbert and Co., of Boston, with an order to pay over the proceeds of the same for the use of the College. This was the way in which Mr Hollis often made his remittances, sending over nails, cutlery, and arms, which were sold to such advantage, that the College commonly received for what cost one hundred pounds sterling in London, about three hundred pounds New England currency. All that he seems to have contemplated at this time, was the foundation of ten scholarships, the incumbents of which were to receive ten pounds each, annually, in the money of this country. The students who availed themselves of this charity, were to be those intended for the ministry. None were to be rejected merely because they were of the Baptist persuasion. He reserved to himself the right of confirming, or not, those whom the Corporation should recommend, and conjured them, again and again, to beware of recommending 'rakes and dunces.'

Having begun to assist the College, his concern for its welfare and general prosperity increased daily, and led to a correspondence with President Leverett, and Dr Colman, on the subject. On its being proposed to him by the former to found a Divinity Professorship, he expressed his surprise that this had not been provided for before, but took the motion into consideration, thinking it, as he said, 'a particular call of Providence.' Accordingly, in 1721, he sent over his proposition to establish the first professorship in the College, and we suppose in the country; fixing his yearly stipend at eighty pounds, New England currency, and agreeing to remit the necessary funds, to be invested here. In drawing up the rules and statutes of the new foundation he was aided by hints and sketches from his American correspondents, to which he refers, August 8, in the following extract from a letter to Dr Colman.

'I have consulted several worthy pastors of churches here, who have studied abroad, as at Edinburgh, Utrecht, Leyden, and are acquainted with the Professors of Divinity's works there; and these gentlemen express a great respect to, and concern for, your University, and would willingly lend any advice they can for your advantage. I have desired them to make some little alterations in your scheme, and some remarks, as their reasons for so doing, which, when finished, I shall send unto you for your more mature consideration; believing you and they have nothing in view herein, but furthering the glory of God, promoting good literature, the knowledge of theology, and the well

understanding of the sacred scriptures. May the Lord, the Spirit of Truth, say, Amen.'

The promised document soon followed, which, as it has never been published in its original form, we shall give entire. It seems to have been prepared by Dr Hunt, as it is in his handwriting, except the words *Italicised*, which are in the handwriting of Mr Neal.

'RULES AND ORDERS PROPOSED RELATING TO A DIVINITY  
PROFESSOR IN HARVARD COLLEGE, IN NEW ENGLAND.

'I. That the Professor be a Master of Arts, and in communion with some Christian Church of one of the three denominations, Congregational, Presbyterian, or Baptist.

'N. B. This agrees with the scheme which was sent from New England, approved by the Rev. the President and the Corporation.

'II. That his province be to instruct the students in the several parts of Theology, by reading a system of positive, and a course of controversial divinity, beginning always with a short prayer.

'We apprehend this article to be of the last importance. The want of a Professor, whose *only* work shall be to make the students *masters* of Divinity, is justly complained of in English Universities, and wisely rectified in the Universities of Edinburgh, and all the foreign Universities we are acquainted with. It will consequently turn to the great advantage of the students to be thus *regularly* instructed in the several parts of Theology without *intermission*, after they have been three or four years in the College; and we are apprehensive it will become very easy to the Professor after he has set in his chair a year or two.

'III. That the said Professor read his private lectures of positive or controversial divinity, so many times in the week as shall finish both courses within the term of one year.

'The Professors in the Universities of Holland, read four times a week on a system, and four times a week on the controversies; such lectures not exceeding three quarters of an hour. The first quarter is spent in examining the students on the heads of the last lecture; then the Professor proceeds, always taking care to finish both his system and course of controversial divinity within the compass of a year. An hour in the morning is generally employed in the system on Mondays, Thursdays and



Fridays, and an hour on the same days in the afternoon, in the controversies; by which means the Professors have two days in the week entire to themselves, and by finishing all in one year, an opportunity is given for new students to enter every year, and the seniors may go over the course with the Professor two or three times, which will be a great advantage; nor will this be at all difficult to the Professor, when he has gone over it once or twice.

‘IV. That the Professor read publicly twice a week in the Hall on Church History, Jewish Antiquities, Cases of Conscience, or Critical Exposition of Scripture, &c., as he shall judge proper. Times of vacation always excepted.

‘This agrees with the New England scheme. We conceive that though it is impossible these public lectures should answer the ends of regular instruction, which is the most necessary to make the students masters of Theology, and fit them for the pulpit, or chair, any more than the preaching two sermons weekly in the pulpit can be thought sufficient to fit all the hearers for the pulpit, yet since they are performed in all our Universities, they are not to be omitted. Give us leave, however, to observe to you, that notwithstanding the several Universities we have had any knowledge of, have laid the strictest injunctions on the Professors to study these lectures, yet in some time they have been generally neglected, and have dwindled into little else than form. We take the liberty to mention Critical Exposition of Scripture, Church History, Jewish Antiquities, &c., that the Professor may give to the students of Divinity as large and extensive a view as can be of every part of learning which is proper to enter into the character of a finished divine.

‘V. That the Professor set apart two or three hours one afternoon in the week, to answer such questions of the students who shall apply to him, as refer to the system or controversies of religion, or laws of conscience, or seeming contradictions in Scripture.

‘This agrees to the New England scheme, and we are informed the Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh, allots two or three hours every Thursday in the afternoon to this work; times of vacation excepted.

‘VI. That the Professor of Divinity (while in that office), shall not be a tutor in any other science, or obliged to any other attendance in the College than the abovementioned public and private lectures.

‘This will make the Professor’s work as easy at least, if not more easy, than the rest of the Tutors.

‘VII. That the Professor read his private lectures, to such only as are at least of two years’ standing in the College.

‘This is intended to remedy an evil too common in most places. When students upon their first coming to the University are encouraged to enter on the study of Divinity, they neglect all preparatory studies, and very often enter on the sacred ministry before they are qualified; whereas by keeping them from the constant and regular study of Theology for the first two or three years, you employ them necessarily in other parts of literature, and effectually prevent their going into the pulpit till they are at least of four years standing. It is not intended by this article to debar the students of divinity from attending on any of the lectures of other tutors, but only that they now begin to make Theology their chief study.

‘VIII. That an honorable salary being provided for the Professor, it is expected that he require no fee from any of the students for their instruction.

‘This agrees with the New England scheme. But if any gentleman desires his son may run through a course of divinity, it does not hinder the parent from making the Professor a present; though the Professor is debarred from requiring anything of such person.

‘IX. That the said Professor be chosen every five years, by the Rev. President and Fellows of the College for the time being, and be presented by them, when chosen, to the Honorable and Reverend Overseers, to be by them approved and confirmed in his place.\*

‘This agrees with the New England scheme.

‘X. That the said Professor be at all times under the inspection of the Reverend the President and Fellows, with the Honorable and Reverend the Overseers, for the time being, to be by them displaced, for any just and valuable cause.

‘This agrees with the New England scheme.

‘XI. That it be recommended to the electors, that at every choice they prefer a man of solid learning in divinity, of sound or orthodox principles; one who is well gifted to teach; of a sober and pious life, and of a grave conversation.

\*This article was afterwards altered, by consent of Mr Hollis, so as to dispense with the necessity of quinquennial re-elections. Slight changes were also made in the phraseology of some of the other articles.

*'These Rules and Orders relating to a Divinity Professor in Harvard College, in New England, were drawn up at the request of Mr Thomas Hollis, and are unanimously recommended by us, as necessary to answer his useful design.'*

DANIEL NEAL,  
W. HARRIS,  
JER. HUNT,  
JOSH. OLDFIELD, D. D.  
MOSES LOWMAN,  
EDW. WALLIN,  
ARTHUR SHALLET.

*'London, August 22, 1721.'*

It will help us to ascertain the meaning and intended bearing of any ambiguous words and phrases in this paper, if we know the religious sentiments of the clergymen by whom it was subscribed, and unanimously recommended. We do not find the name of Daniel Neal among those who voted on the trial question at Salters' Hall, and it appears that he, Dr Watts, and others of the same stamp, were not present at the meeting, or, which is more probable, that they soon left it, being disgusted at the violence of some of the speakers. He was the well known author of the *History of the Puritans*, and perhaps it would be difficult to find in the whole compass of English literature, a more earnest and disinterested advocate of civil and religious liberty. This he carried so far, that, though inclined to Calvinism himself, he was opposed, in all cases, to the application of tests of human device in matters of conscience, even the test of a party name. He married a cousin of Mr Hollis's, and lived several years, it would seem, in his family.

Dr William Harris was an active and leading member of the Liberal party at Salters' Hall. He was the intimate friend of Lardner, who preached a funeral sermon on his death, in which he speaks of him in terms of the highest respect and veneration. Dr Grosvenor, who preached another sermon on the same occasion, says;—'To me he seemed to be of no party. Men might call him by what name they pleased; he was fond of no denomination but that of a Christian.'

We have spoken at length of Dr Hunt's character and religious opinions in another place.

It is enough to say of Dr Oldfield, that he was moderator of the Salters' Hall Assembly, and continued to preside at all their meetings after the strictly Orthodox had seceded. In

regard to the trinity, he seems to have adhered in general to the same sentiments, or at least to the same language, in which he was educated ; but he was very far from confining his charity, or his friendship, to those who could go along with him in his speculations on this disputed dogma. 'He was of no party,' says Dr Harris, who preached his funeral sermon, 'but that of God against the devil, and of all serious Christians.'

Moses Lowman was one of the profoundest scholars of his age, particularly in Hebrew and Rabbinical learning. He was remarkable for following out original investigations, and abiding by the results, careless whether they accorded, or not, with received opinions ; and he was the last man on earth to withhold from others the liberty he asserted for himself. His views of Jesus Christ may be gathered from *Three Tracts on the Shekinah and Logos*, written by him, and published a few years after his death, with an original Preface, by Dr Chandler and Dr Lardner. It will be recollected that this work suggested the leading position in the interesting and valuable *Letters of Mr Upham on the Logos*, who has clearly shown that Lowman's principles and results, distinctly stated, become simple Unitarianism.

Edward Wallin is the only one among the signers, who voted with the Exclusionists in the *Salters' Hall* controversy. He was a Baptist minister in London, and was indebted to this circumstance, probably, more than to anything else, for whatever he enjoyed of Mr Hollis's intimacy and confidence. It is remarkable that Mr Hollis associated generally with the Presbyterians and Independents, probably because they were better educated and more liberal ; but as he was a Baptist himself, it would not do to exclude altogether the ministers of his own denomination.

Nothing is known of Arthur Shallett, but that he divided with the Liberal party at *Salters' Hall*.

From these slight notices it appears, that of the seven who subscribed and recommended the *Rules and Orders*, all but Wallin had declared themselves for liberality and catholicism ; a majority were opposed to tests in any shape, even to the test of a party name ; and probably two of them, at least, at the time of signing their names, were Unitarians, and one of these drew up the instrument. We subjoin the declaration, which the professor was required to make on entering the office, copied *verbatim* from a paper in Mr Hollis's own handwriting,



addressed to the President and Fellows. It is important as evincing the construction which Mr Hollis himself put on the Rules and Orders; for if his object had been to provide that his professors, in all future time, should hold any one of the controverted doctrines among Christians, the trinity, for example, this was the place in which to insist on its recognition and acknowledgement.

*'A Plan of a Form for the Professor of Divinity to agree to at his Inauguration.'*

'That he repeat his oaths to the civil government.

'That he declare it as his belief that the bible is the only, and most perfect rule of faith and manners; and that he promise to explain and open the scriptures to his pupils with integrity and faithfulness, according to the best light that God shall give him.

'That he promise to promote true piety and godliness by his example and instruction.

'That he consult the good of the College, and the peace of the churches, on all occasions, and—

'That he religiously observe the statutes of his Founder.

'Signed by me, THOMAS HOLLIS.'

After this, one can hardly repress his indignation at the following entry in the records of the Overseers, which was ordered to be made January 24, 1722, when the question was taken on consenting with the Corporation in the choice of Edward Wigglesworth, the first professor. We insert it, however, because it shows how different the declaration, as prescribed by Mr Hollis, would have been, if he had had a tythe of the bigotry and exclusiveness of the New England clergy at that time, or if he had intended, like them, to exclude Arminians and Unitarians. It shows, also, that those were not days in which professors were permitted to believe in creeds, and catechisms, and other books, 'for substance,'—a mysterious phrase, the precise import of which has never been given—but were expected, as Dr South would say, to swallow them whole. Requiring Mr Wigglesworth to assent to 'the divine right of infant baptism,' seems almost like a studied insult to the known sentiments of the generous and liberal-minded benefactor, who was endeavouring to raise them from beggary.

'Ordered, by the Overseers, that a minute be taken and recorded of the several heads in divinity, upon which the Corporation examined Mr Wigglesworth; viz.

'That he approved before the Corporation, and declared his assent,

'I. To Dr Ames's *Medulla Theologiæ*;

'II. To the Confession of Faith contained in the Assembly's Catechism;

'III. To the doctrinal Articles of the Church of England; more particularly,

'1. To the doctrine of the Holy Trinity;

'2. To the doctrine of the eternal Godhead of the blessed Saviour;

'3. To the doctrine of predestination;

'4. To the doctrine of special efficacious grace;

'5. To the divine right of infant baptism.'

It is but justice to the Government of the College to say, that this outrage on the will and spirit of the founder of the professorship has never been repeated. We may also observe, in this connexion, that all the successors of Dr Wigglesworth, are understood to have departed more or less from strict Calvinism.\*

\* Even the elder Wigglesworth made, after all, but a sorry Calvinist. He was the author of one of the ablest and most successful publications against the revival fever in the time of Whitefield. In 1763 he published 'The Doctrine of Reprobation briefly considered; being the Substance of some Lectures in Harvard College;' part of the concluding paragraph of which runs thus;—'And yet all this does not hinder, but that far the bigger part of those who attain the mercy of God unto eternal life, may have been chosen to it, upon a foresight, not of their faith and repentance, but of their diligent improvement of the means of grace, and earnest prayer for the aids of God's Holy Spirit. And so notwithstanding anything in the decrees of God, there may be a certain connexion between striving to enter in at the strait gate, and admission into it.'

This roused the slumbering Calvinism of the Province against the backsliders at Cambridge; and, as usually happens in such cases, some were grieved, some were angry, and some affected to be one or the other, or both, as would best promote their interest or popularity. Dr Wigglesworth wrote a defence of the obnoxious passage in a letter to a neighbouring clergyman, which has never been printed; but the manuscript is now before us, prefaced with some remarks by Dr Wigglesworth's son, who succeeded him in the divinity chair;—'When my father,' says he, 'had written the following letter, vindicating the passage excepted against, he at several times expressed his desire that it might be made public. After he had published his discourse on Reprobation, he had a mind that the public should be acquainted with his thoughts on the ground of particular election. But as his sentiments on this head were something different from those commonly received, and as he was in the decline of life, he was discouraged from making the publication, lest, in the eye of the world, he should resemble an old man giving a challenge to a combat, after he had lost the strength and vigor of his body.'

'One or two days before my father's death, I inquired of him whether he had any directions to leave relating to his manuscripts. He replied,

The first distinct notice which Mr Hollis gave of his intention to found a professorship of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, is found in a letter to Dr Colman, January, 1726. All eyes were immediately turned on Isaac Greenwood, who had been graduated at the College in 1721, as the most promising candidate for this office; and a visit to England about this time enabled him to qualify himself more perfectly for the expected appointment. Mr Hollis saw him frequently while abroad, and afforded him all the facilities in his power, but did not attempt to conceal from his American correspondents his dissatisfaction from the first, with many things in the manners and conduct of the young traveller. Unquestionably a man of genius and learning, he was also eccentric, improvident, and fond of display; and, to crown all, having contracted heavy debts in London, which he had no means of paying, he absconded, and returned home by the way of Lisbon. A letter, which Mr Hollis wrote soon afterwards to Dr Colman, shows that the patron was not very proud of his *protégé*.

‘I take notice what you and others write concerning Mr Greenwood; and read in your Gazette of his designed lectures in Mathematics for this winter; and of some of you admitting

that he should have been glad to have published the following letter, had a suitable occasion presented. I told him that I had once transcribed it, and could do it again. Upon which he gave me the liberty of publishing it.

‘A fear of lessening my usefulness, in the opinion of a number of valuable gentlemen, in the station in which the providence of God hath placed me, hath prevented my making the publication. But that my father’s sentiments may be fully known, and impartially weighed by the sons of the College, I have carefully transcribed it for the public library.’

These statements, and two or three passages which we shall give from the manuscript letter itself, make it probable that the first professor on Mr Hollis’s foundation, at his death, differed about as much from the popular theology of the time being, as the present incumbent.

‘If it be further objected, that one who is not born again of the spirit, cannot strive, and pray to God for help, from any better principle than self-love, I answer, that though this is not the only, nor the best principle that we should act from; yet, so far as it is well directed, it is a good principle; a principle which God himself hath implanted in our natures on purpose to excite us to pursue our best interests, and which, therefore, ought to have its influence on the best of men, as it had on our blessed Lord himself, when, for the joy which was set before him, he endured the cross, despising the shame. Heb. xii. 2. Now, if there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, why may we not think that every tendency to repentance is so far pleasing, as it proceeds from a good principle, though it be not the only principle, nor the best, from which it should proceed?’

‘But it may be said, that unregenerated persons are out of Christ; whereas, it is in and through him only, that we can be accepted. To

him to preach, which I think was very hasty. However, I shall forbear telling hearsays of him to you, or him, or others, wishing his future carriage may be sober, religious, diligent, and becoming his profession and calling. And if the Corporation shall be unanimous in electing him, and recommending him to me, I think I shall accept him as my professor.'

Mr Greenwood was inaugurated in 1728. A fact is disclosed in Mr Hollis's correspondence, which makes his readiness to comply with the wishes of the Corporation in this appointment, a work of uncommon magnanimity. After he had begun to suspect Mr Greenwood's unfitness for the place, he suggested another candidate; a gentleman whom he had himself assisted in pursuing his studies on the continent, and who could bring the most flattering testimonials from the first scholars in Europe. But then he was a Baptist, of the same denomination with Mr Hollis himself, and this was an insuperable objection. The proposal was rejected instantly, peremptorily, almost rudely.

In addition to the funds remitted for the support of two professorships, Mr Hollis expended considerable sums in purchasing books for the library, and a philosophical apparatus; and not satisfied with giving, himself, he importuned others, and in this way procured many valuable contributions. Most of the books

which I answer, that though it be only when we are in Christ that we are in a state of complete acceptance, yet a sense of our sinful and miserable state, and of our need of God's grace and spirit to help us out of it, and our earnest desires and prayers to God for them, are as to the matter of them good; they proceed from a good principle, a principle, which (as hath been already observed), God hath implanted in us on purpose to prompt us to seek our own eternal happiness, and they are agreeable to the will of God, which is our sanctification, and who commandeth all men, everywhere, to repent. Now, since a converted state is acceptable to God through Jesus Christ, why may not all the tendencies and preparation to it be thought in some measure acceptable also—the degrees of acceptance being proportioned to the difference which there is between the preparation to this state, and the perfection of it?

'Upon the whole, I am fully persuaded that no sinner will be able to plead at the last day, Lord, I would have repented of my sins, believed in thee, and obeyed thy gospel, but I was destitute of strength sufficient for these things. I knew that thy grace was sufficient for me, and that thou hadst said, Ask, and ye shall receive; and therefore I earnestly implored those assistances of thine Holy Spirit, without which I could do nothing to any effectual purpose for myself, but they were withheld from me. Instead of this, I believe that the conscience of every sinner at that day will justify the Judge, and condemn his own negligence and folly; and that it will appear to be a day of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God.'—Professor Wigglesworth's MS. Letter, pp. 32-34.



presented by him were theological, selected expressly for this object by Dr Hunt; and the general character of some of them, at least, may be guessed by what he writes in regard to a single parcel;—

‘I have expectation of another parcel of books to send by this or next shipping; and if there happen to be some books not quite orthodox, in search after truth with an honest design, do not be afraid of them. A public library ought to be furnished, if they can, with *con*, as well as *pro*, that students may read, try, judge, see for themselves, and believe upon argument and just reasonings of scripture. “Thus saith Aristotle,” “Thus saith Calvin,” will not now pass for proof in our London disputations.’ \*

The last years of Mr Hollis were occupied almost exclusively in deeds of public and private charity; the tranquil and serene evening of a well-spent life. He died January 22, 1731. The words of Professor Greenwood, in this connexion, are appropriate and beautiful;—

‘As in the vegetable kingdom, it is with a superior pleasure and expectation, that we consider the revival of such plants as have always been distinguished by the plenty and delicacy of their fruit; so with earnest desires and hopes we should wait for the day, when we shall behold the resurrection of such as have distinguished themselves by acts of charity and bounty.’—  
Philosophical Discourse, p. 22.

The slight and scattered notices which we have collected of the subject of this memoir, give the prominent traits in his character. Our information is not sufficiently minute to enable us to do much to fill up the outline. He had a competent knowledge of Latin and French, and wrote his own language with as much correctness and facility as most of the divines of

\* The books and philosophical apparatus sent over by Mr Hollis were destroyed at the burning of Harvard Hall, on the night of January 24, 1764. The fire is supposed to have begun in a beam under the hearth of the library, which had been used the day before by the General Court, in session there because of the small pox then in Boston. The night was tempestuous, a snow storm attended with high wind; and, it being vacation, only two or three students were in their rooms, and these so situated, that they did not discover the fire until the flames had gained such head as to defy all opposition. Above six thousand volumes were consumed, comprising, among the rest, the whole library of Dr Lightfoot, the library of Dr Theophilus Gale, several theological works presented by Bishop Sherlock, and the Latin and Greek Classics, presented by Bishop Berkley.

that day. He appears to have carried the exact and methodical habits of a merchant into all his affairs, and annoyed the Government of the College incessantly with complaints about their loose way of doing business. He was plain and downright in his manners, and sometimes, it would seem, a little testy.\* In order to act on his vanity, and induce him to give still more largely, the College Government, and the General Court, as well as private individuals, plied him with compliments and flattery; but he had the good sense to see through these arts. Nobody can read his letters without being convinced that he was actuated by a sincere, consistent, and rational piety; and that his liberality to Harvard College grew out of a conviction that he was aiding to build up an institution dedicated to Christ and the Church.

It is desirable to ascertain, as clearly as we can, the religious sentiments of Mr Hollis, particularly in his last days. He was a Dissenter, 'rooted and grounded;' and if there was any subject on which his accustomed charity and candor failed him, it was this. We should remember, however, that he wrote under a keen sense of political wrongs, that the fanaticism preached up by Sacheverell was still fresh in his recollections, and that he honestly believed, and not without reason, that the hierarchy wanted but the power and there would be an end to English liberty. In this state of mind he must have heard, with extreme regret, in 1722, that Dr Cutler,† rector of Yale College, and several other Congregational ministers in Connecticut, had applied for Episcopal ordination.

'Believe me, Sir,' he writes to Dr Colman, 'this will be cause of real grief to you, and others like-minded to you. For what with their new ceremonies and orders, probably accompanied with a defection in morals, it must be far worse than the different sentiments of a few honest Christians about the mode of

\* Professor Wigglesworth, the father, wrote a fine, thick, and cramped hand, which it was almost impossible to decypher. Mr Hollis begins one of his letters to him thus;—'Mr Professor, Dear Sir; I have received your letter dated July 11, which I doubt not is very good, but so small a character I must guess at the sense. I beseech you, if you write any business that requires an answer, never write to me any more so. If you will not write larger (for I doubt not but you can), get some one to transcribe it in a character I may read; or else never write to me again. It is a pain to me, who value Mr Wigglesworth, to think or find I cannot read his letters.'

† Afterwards first rector of Christ Church in this city.

baptism ; because these new schismatics will have numbers and powers on their side to encourage them. It will cause you, and other faithful ministers, to stir up their auditories the more to holy living, and examining the grounds for their practice and dissent from the national church, and occasionally be turned for a blessing among you. Persecution for religious tenets, through Divine favor, has now been restrained in England for many years, but it is not without reason, that some think, should God for holy purposes suffer our clergy at London to domineer as in a late reign, our meetinghouses would be strangely thinned. Few, comparatively, among us, considering or remembering the true causes of our separate meetings, the rest only go to them because that ordinarily they find there the best preaching.'

Again, he writes to President Leverett ;

'Dr Cutler is now returned for Boston, I think with Captain Ruggles. He goes over reordained, but I think not rebaptized ; for want of which, according to his narrow, uncharitable, and Dodwellian principles, I do not see how he can rightly baptize others ; and he ought to be pushed, and made to doubt. I have urged him to a larger charity, and for peace, according to my talent, in word and deed. This man's character is to be treated among you in a different manner from the common and vicious missionaries. He was reputed one of your faith and order, but Demas-like, he has loved the world, and is departed from you, and as a bold schismatic becomes the head of a party, and dares you fairly. He is above board ; he will do all he is able, to bring men over to his beloved notions of Episcopal ordination, as necessary ; and he has a great advantage of many by his calmness and sedateness in his disputing. I have seen him pushed to an absurdity, and yet not appear ruffled or discountenanced. He told me he could wish he could convert me ; but I trust, I am in some measure confirmed in the present truth, and my hope is in God, that he will keep me from falling, and preserve me blameless, and that my dearest Saviour will, in his time, present me faultless. Glory be to the Father through Jesus Christ.—Amen.'

The Dissenting interest in England was sustained at this time almost exclusively by the 'three denominations,' as they are called, the Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists. Mr Hollis went with the last, a preference early formed, as he says, on inquiry and conviction, and held through life, but without the smallest mixture of bigotry or exclusiveness against the others. He was aware that this sect was an object of extreme

dislike to some in the College Government, and to the New England Congregationalists generally.

‘I have been prevailed on at your instances, to sit the first time for my picture, a present to your Hall. I doubt not that they are pleased with my monies, but I have some reason to think that some among you will not be well pleased to see the shade of a Baptist hung there, unless you get a previous order to admit it, and forbidding any indecencies to it; for if they do, though I am at a distance, the birds of the air will tell it, and I shall be grieved, as I have been already.’

This was in a private letter to Dr Colman. After the picture was done, he writes as follows, to President Leverett.

‘In compliance with your and the Corporation’s request, which you with Mr Colman made to me in your letter of February last, I now send you my shade by Captain Cary, to be put up in your College Hall; and I desire their favorable acceptance of it. My wife, and some others of my family, seconded your letter, or else I should hardly have been so vain as to have attempted it. Perhaps some among you will be pleased with the picture for the painter’s performance, though others may secretly despise it, because of the particular principle of the original. Let such know, I have read, believed, and practised upon conviction; and which among them who are thinkers can believe as they will, but upon evidence, as any doctrine appears to their minds, till they are better informed? And tell them, Mr Hollis means nothing by all he has done, and is doing for your college, but for the glory of God, and the good of souls, by assisting them in their studies of the sacred writings, whereby the gospel of Christ Jesus, and the great truths therein contained, may be well proved and preached unto others; that by the influences of the Holy Spirit attending their ministry, men may come to be sincere Christians, evidencing it in faith and practice, without any regard to either of the three denominations, or parties of Protestant Dissenters. To all of such I desire to express my christian charity.’

Though not attaching much importance to the peculiarities of the Baptists, he was a true friend to the sect, and availed himself of every opportunity to serve them. In one of his letters to Dr Colman, he says;—

‘I have given some intimation to the Baptist churches in Pennsylvania and the Jerseys, of my design in your college for promoting learning. They have many churches and preachers



among them, by the accounts sent me, but I find not one preacher among them that understands the languages. If any from those parts should now, or hereafter make application to your college, I beseech them, the College, to show kindness to such, and stretch their charity a little. It is what I wish the Baptists would do, though I have no great expectation, as what I think would be for advantage of the christian faith; especially while there are so many Quakers among them.'

Again he says, in writing to the same gentleman;—

'You have written me in a kind manner, in relation to Mr E. Callender,\* once or twice, and of his church. I was thinking to suggest to you, as a means to increase charity, that on some proper occasion he might be invited to join with your churches in days of fasting or thanksgiving; or that some one or other of you might offer to exchange a pulpit with him, on your lecture days, or Lord's-days. I leave it to your prudence. It is frequently practised in London among the three denominations.'

Some obscurity rests over the question how far Mr Hollis was a believer in the 'doctrines of grace,' so called. Neither his life, nor his religious connexions, nor the printed accounts of him, would lead us to suspect him of Calvinism, if we except the following lines from Mr Rudd's† poem on his death.

'Cease, mournful maid, the tale is known too well.  
Rather proclaim for ancient truths his zeal,  
(Dealt all his favors undistinguished still)  
For truths there were Hollis would boldly own,  
Loose as the age, and desperate, is grown.  
Such did imputed righteousness appear,  
Title to heaven, and ground of pardon here;  
Such, Christ, the honors of thy reverend name;  
Such, glorious Spirit, thy celestial flame;

\* Elisha Callender, then minister of the first Baptist Church in this city. Mr Hollis often refers to him in his correspondence, sending him books, commending him to his friends, and paying him other attentions.

† Sayer Rudd began his career among the strict Baptists, and preached in several places. At length he resolved to visit France, and as his church would not give him their consent, he went without it. On his return he preached among the Baptists again, but failed of gaining a settlement, as he was understood to have given up the trinity. Some years after he was settled over an Arian congregation, but the society gradually declining, and he himself being almost entirely disowned by his own denomination, it put him out of humor with the Dissenters generally. He finally conformed, and accepted of a living in the Establishment. At the time of writing his monody on Mr Hollis he was a Calvinistic Baptist.

Such the grand mystery of the eternal Three,  
Persons if meant, but one if Deity.  
On these he frankly did his thoughts disclose,  
For these his interest frequent interpose ;  
Nor silent would the injurious tongue indure,  
But curb that malice, which 't is God's to cure.'

pp. 23, 24.

To this passage he appends a note, from which it appears, that he is only reporting a hearsay.

'I have been informed, that Mr Hollis entertained a very honorable esteem for the doctrine of the ever blessed trinity, the imputed righteousness of Christ, &c., and that his openly avowing these principles was a check upon some, who appeared to have no great opinion of them.'

A few expressions occur in the unpublished correspondence of Mr Hollis, that seem to imply a belief in the trinity, and in Calvinism, or at least in some of its peculiar doctrines. There is a long letter to Dr Colman, in which he recounts his religious experience from childhood, and adopts, for the most part, the phraseology usual in such narratives as given by Calvinists. But it should be considered that he knew himself to be writing to a Calvinist, whom he wished to please and conciliate ; and also that in the same letter he commends Dr Hunt, and, in speaking of the difficulties in his society, takes part with Dr Hunt's friends against the strict Calvinists. Besides, this letter was written ten years before Mr Hollis's death, during which time we think we can see him inclining more and more toward rational views ; precisely what was to be expected from the greater leisure he had for the investigation of truth, after quitting business, and from his frequent intercourse with such men as Dr Hunt, Mr Lowman, and Lord Barrington. The passage, however, in Mr Hollis's correspondence which looks most like proper Calvinism, is found in a letter written not long afterwards to the same gentleman.

'Mr Hirst was at my house while I was visiting the poor at St Thomas's Hospital, April 23, and left me your book, and your letter, dated February 6, for which I thank you. My wife urged him to stay to dinner, or come again in an hour, when I came home to dinner ; but he did not come, nor have I yet seen him, to talk as you desired me. His father appeared a serious, religious man, that worked hard for heaven. It had been happy he had been led a little more clearly into the doctrine of free

justification through faith alone. He might possibly have had a more comfortable frame of mind ; though I doubt not he had a safe state, and in many things greatly to be commended. I shall be glad to be in such a resigned frame when my change comes.'

On the whole, it appears, that Mr Hollis was educated in a belief of Calvinism, then the prevalent and almost universal creed of the Dissenters. He began to use the language of this creed, long before he can be supposed to have used it understandingly ; and it is probable that a habit of using it vaguely and mechanically was early formed, which continued with him to the last. While, therefore, he used the language of a Calvinist, and thought himself one, it is probable, that, like many others, he was in fact an Arminian, perhaps a Unitarian, without knowing it. At the same time, after he became advanced in life, it is not unlikely, that according to Mr Rudd, when young ministers began to lay aside the old phrases in their preaching and conversation, and introduce new and strange ones, he expressed some of the jealousy and impatience, which an old man is apt to feel in regard to all innovations. It is astonishing how slow and reluctant most men are to relinquish the religious phraseology in which they have been educated, which has become easy and familiar to them, and with which they have associated, no matter how erroneously, their first religious impressions, and the strictness and piety of their fathers. Almost every great change in the public faith has been introduced, therefore, by giving to the old terms new or modified significations, rather than by attempting at once a new and more exact nomenclature. Even the Arians at Exeter, intelligent, courageous, and high principled as they were, persisted for a long time, through fear, or policy, or the indistinctness of their views, in using language proper and consistent in Trinitarians only.

Whatever Mr Hollis may have thought of Calvinism himself, it is morally certain that he did not withhold the christian name, or his christian sympathies, from those who dissented from it. This is proved by his whole history ; by the character of the men, whose society he courted and preferred ; by his conduct in regard to his own minister, and the Arians at Exeter ; and by almost every extract which we have given from his correspondence. We might give many more passages to the same purpose, but one or two will suffice.

‘I shall take pleasure,’ he writes to Dr Colman, ‘in recommending the catholic communion of saints on all proper occasions, and do love them that show, by their works, they love Christ Jesus; while I bear with others who are sincere in their more confined charity, as I would they should bear with me in my more enlarged. We search after truth; we yet see but in part; happy the man who reduces his notions into a constant train of practice. Our great Lord and High Priest bears much and long with every one of us. I expect a better state, perfectly happy; to be brought to it, and consummated in it by him who is able to subdue all things to himself. Charity is the grace that now adorns us, and prepares us for glory. May it always abide in your breast and mine, and grow more and more.’

In regard to the trinity, he was particularly averse to exclusive measures, holding it to be a mystery, which no one could explain, and on which, therefore, no one should be required to express himself, but in the words of scripture. Dr Colman had sent him Judah Monis’s three Essays, which he thus notices.

‘I wish you, Sir, to instruct him a little better in the christian doctrine of more extensive charity, and not to judge too hastily of his neighbour, and exclude from salvation every one that differs from him in the application and belief of the article of the trinity. A glorious truth it is; but the manner of explaining it appears difficult, so difficult that scarce two can say exactly alike, except they agree on a form, and agree to write after it.’

Mr Hollis insists frequently and imperatively on a written bond, by which the Corporation should bind themselves and their successors, forever, to observe his Rules and Orders for the Divinity Professorship; but his object in doing this has been strangely misapprehended. It was to prevent a body of bigoted Calvinists and Congregationalists from throwing aside his Rules and Orders, which were entirely liberal, and adopting others in their room, which he knew would be exclusive. Accordingly he writes to Dr Colman, August 18, 1722;—

‘I do now intreat you to acquaint Mr President and the Corporation, that they should send me over some writing obligatory, that they will now, and in all time following, perform this my trust committed to them, pursuant to my Orders, which I have signed, and shall sign with my hand and seal; which I may leave with my heirs at my decease, who may have some power to examine that your successors are faithful in their trust, and



do not divert the principal, nor income, to other purposes. The late uncharitable reflections of some upon the Baptists as not orthodox, together with the present or later motions of some to alter by changing or increasing hands in the governing power of the Corporation, makes me think it to be needful, and I hope they will grant it me.'

From this passage it is plain, that the fears of the founder of the professorship were, that the term 'orthodox,' as used in his Rules and Orders, would be interpreted too exclusively, and not too liberally. He seems, indeed, to have suspected something worse; for, in a subsequent letter to the same gentleman, he writes ;—

'I was displeased to hear that another person at your board should say to this effect, on reading my Orders, that when Mr Hollis was dead, they could make new orders for him.'

He knew that if they did make 'new orders' for him, they would be so framed, like the declaration required of Mr Wigglesworth before his election, as to shut out forever from the office, Baptists, Arminians, and Unitarians. This was what Mr Hollis resolved to prevent. We see, therefore, why it was that the most liberal among his advisers, Lord Barrington and Dr Hunt, were among the most earnest in urging him to insist on the bond.\*

All the authorities on the subject, without a solitary exception, concur in the view here given of Mr Hollis's liberal intentions. Professor Wigglesworth says ;—

'The expressions of his bounty were not confined to a party. And indeed by his frequent and ample benefactions, for the encouragement of theological, as well as humane knowledge among us, who are Christians of a different denomination from himself, he hath set such an example of a generous, catholic, and christian spirit, as hath never before fallen within my observation; nor (so far as I now remember), within my reading. However, it was nothing but what appeared in the constant tenor of his

\* There is another passage, in which Mr Hollis shows that his only apprehension was from the government of the College being in the hands of Exclusionists. He writes to Dr Colman ;—'I take notice of your election of Mr Sewall, to be the President of Harvard College; and after due waiting, that he has declined, for weighty reasons, accepting that honorable and laborious chair. I am well pleased he is not at the head of my donations, having been informed how strait he is in principle, and narrow in his charity to poor despised Baptists.' We hardly need add, that Dr Sewall, here referred to, was the strictest Calvinist and greatest bigot of his day.

letters, that he did not apprehend the kingdom of God to consist in meat and drink, but in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the holy ghost.'—Sermon on the Death of Hollis, pp. 21, 22.

Dr Colman, is equally explicit.

'To the honor of my country, I must add, that it was some account Mr Hollis received from us of the free and catholic air we breathe at our Cambridge, where Protestants of every denomination may have their children educated, and graduated in our College, if they behave with sobriety and virtue, that took his generous heart, and fixed it on us, and enlarged it to us. And this shall be with me among his distinguishing praises, while we rise up and bless his memory; i. e. bless God in the remembrance of all the undeserved favors done us by him.'

Funeral Sermon, p. 5.

The biographer of Thomas Hollis, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, in speaking of the subject of this memoir, and his two brothers, says;—

'It should be remembered, to the honor of these worthy men, that their donations to Harvard College were conferred without any exclusive conditions relative to religious sects or denominations.'—Vol. 1. p. 1.

Even Mr Rudd, the great and only authority on which much reliance is placed by those who maintain that Mr Hollis was a strict Trinitarian and Calvinist, admits, however, that he did not regard his theological leanings in the bestowment of his charities; that he

'Dealt all his favors undistinguished still.'

Instead of engaging directly in the controversy respecting the Hollis Professorship of Divinity, we have preferred to collect and set before our readers, in these slight historical notices, the necessary materials for making up an opinion on the subject. We shall add a few words, however, on the use of the term 'orthodox,' in the last article of the Rules and Orders of this foundation. The whole article runs thus;—

'That the person chosen from time to time to be Professor, be a man of solid learning in divinity, of sound or orthodox principles, one who is well gifted to teach, of a sober and pious life, and good conversation.'\*

\* Foundations and Statutes of the Professorships and Tutorships at Harvard University. The original of the Rules and Orders, as here printed, is missing.

On comparing this article with the corresponding one in the Rules and Orders, as inserted above, we are struck with a various reading of some consequence. In the copy given above, and also in another in Mr Hollis's own handwriting, the first which he sent over duly signed, the article begins differently. 'That it be recommended to the electors, that at every choice, they prefer a man of solid learning in divinity, of sound or orthodox principles.' It is true, this difference has no bearing on the true interpretation of the term 'orthodox,' which occurs in all the copies, and is used in the same connexion in all, and ought obviously to be understood in the same sense. But it shows, that, in framing originally this part of the instrument, nothing was further from Mr Hollis's intentions, than tying up the hands of the electors. However we understand the term 'orthodox,' it does not appear that he required them to choose an orthodox man, but only that he recommended it. Neither does it appear that the change in the phraseology of the article, grew out of any change in Mr Hollis's purpose in this respect. If such a change had really taken place, it would have led to some remarks, and we have not met with a syllable on the subject in all his letters.

The question recurs, What does the term 'orthodox' mean, as used in the existing statutes of this professorship? Orthodoxy, in its strict and etymological acceptance, does not stand for any set of opinions or doctrines actually held in the church, but for the truth, or right opinion. Dr Johnson defines it, 'soundness in opinion and doctrine,' leaving it, of course, still open to discussion, What is 'soundness?' This is the sense in which the word, or rather the adjective derived from it, is to be understood in the passage before us, as may be inferred from the connexion. The epithet 'orthodox,' is not added as meaning anything more than 'sound;' for it is not said that the principles of the candidate should be sound *and* orthodox, but only that they should be 'sound *or* orthodox,' making 'orthodox' and 'sound,' convertible terms. The candidate should be a man of orthodox principles, that is, of sound and correct principles; leaving it, of course, for the electors to decide what shall be considered as evidence of sound and correct principles, just as it is left for them to decide what shall be considered as evidence of 'a sober and pious life and good conversation.'

There is, we are aware, a loose and popular sense, in which

the term 'orthodox' is used in some places, as designating the opinions of the majority for the time being. By the Orthodox in Catholic countries, we are sometimes to understand those who strictly adhere to the decrees of the Council of Trent; by the Orthodox in England, those who maintain the Arminian interpretation of the Thirtynine Articles, and by the Orthodox in this country, those who hold a modified form of Calvinism, which, however, strictly speaking, is not Calvinism. But it is obvious, that no man would have used the term in this loose and popular sense, without anything to fix and determine its signification, in a solemn instrument which was to be binding on all posterity. Doubtless the term in question was often used by the Dissenters in Mr Hollis's time, and by Mr Hollis himself, as synonymous with Calvinistic. But is not everybody using terms of this sort, sometimes in their strict and proper, and sometimes in their local and sectarian acceptation? Besides, if the governors of the College are required to select a man for the divinity professorship, who is Orthodox, in the local and sectarian sense of that term, as used by the Dissenters a hundred years ago, there is not, probably, throughout New England a single individual, even among the reputed Calvinists at the present day, whom they could place in the chair with a clear conscience. The reputed Orthodox amongst us, at the present day, by giving up, as we believe they have done universally, the doctrine of imputation, have departed as really and essentially from the proper and strict Calvinism of the Puritans, as if they had given up the doctrine of the trinity.

Considering only the term itself, therefore, and the connexion in which it is found, we should conclude, without the shadow of a doubt, that the word 'orthodox,' in these Rules and Orders, was not intended to restrict the Corporation and Overseers to the choice of a Calvinist and Trinitarian. When we recur to the history of the instrument, and recollect by whom it was drawn up and recommended, what before we confidently believed, is converted into moral certainty. Can we suppose, that Neal, and Harris, and Hunt, and Oldfield, and Lowman, and Shallett, would have joined to recommend the exclusive principle in religion? the very principle, which, at that moment, they were contending against in their own country, and had been contending against all their days? Can we suppose that Hunt and Lowman would have been the idiots, the dotards, not only to recommend the adoption of the exclusive principle, but to



recommend its adoption against their own tenets? If it had been a part of Mr Hollis's intention, by these Rules and Orders, to exclude Arminians and Unitarians, can we suppose that he would have employed Dr Hunt himself, an Arminian and Unitarian, to draw up the paper? Can we suppose that he would have employed his own minister, whom he so often heard preaching against Calvinism, to prepare the statutes of the new professorship, in the expectation that he would do it in such a manner as to exclude from this professorship forever, all but Calvinists? Moreover, what reason have we to suspect, with regard to Mr Hollis himself, that he had so soon forgotten the liberal side he had taken in the difficulties between Dr Hunt and his people, and in the Salters' Hall controversy, and was now disposed to act on that very principle of exclusiveness, which, for years, he had been so constant and loud in reprobating as unjust and unchristian? What reason have we to suspect, that he did not mean that we should put the most liberal construction on the term 'orthodox' in these statutes, especially when we remember, that in the only instance in which he alludes to the subject at all in his correspondence, he expresses an anxiety lest the term should be interpreted, not too liberally, but too exclusively.

This, then, is our conclusion. Mr Hollis had strong political antipathies against the Church of Rome, and the Church of England; but in regard to all differences among Christians, purely theological, we believe he intended that his professorship should be entirely open.

The donations of Mr Hollis to Harvard College amounted to about seventeen hundred and fifty pounds sterling, or to about five thousand pounds of the depreciated currency of the Province, equal to seven thousand, seven hundred, and seventy-seven dollars of our money. This, considering the relative value of money at that time, was one of the most liberal and munificent benefactions which our College has ever received. We may form some notion of the difference in the relative value of money then and now, when we are told, that the yearly stipend, granted in the first instance to the divinity professor, was only eighty pounds currency, or about twentysix pounds sterling; and this in the Rules and Orders is called an 'honorable stipend.'

The following is, we believe, a true account of the present state of the funds given to the College by the elder Hollis ;—

Appropriated for the Divinity Professor,	\$2606 67
For the Professor of Natural Philosophy } and Mathematics,	2606 67
For the College Treasurer,	520 00
For Indigent Scholars,	2680 00

Whole amount,	\$8413 34
---------------	-----------

It will be seen from this statement, that the divinity professor can derive from these funds, supposing them invested at six *per cent.*, but about one hundred and fifty of the fifteen hundred dollars, his regular salary. So far, therefore, as the interests of the College are concerned, it is not of much importance how the controversy about this professorship is determined. But it is of great importance to the good name of Mr Hollis, that he should be protected against the unjust imputation of being a bigot.

There were three benefactors to the College, who bore the name of Thomas Hollis, and who are often confounded together. Thomas Hollis, the subject of this memoir, who died 1731. Thomas Hollis, nephew and heir of the preceding, and son of Nathaniel. Of this man little is known, except that he gave the College two hundred pounds sterling, and died in 1735. The family estates then descended to his only son, Thomas Hollis, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn. This gentleman gave for the library of the College about fourteen hundred pounds sterling. There is a memoir of him compiled by Archdeacon Blackburne, in two quarto volumes. We learn from his biographer, that he connected himself with no religious sect. He died January 1, 1774. With the exception of a few legacies, he bequeathed his whole property to his friend, Thomas Brand, Esq., of the Hyde in Essex, who afterwards assumed the name of Hollis. He also presented the College many valuable books for the library in his lifetime, and one hundred pounds sterling at his decease. There is a memoir of him in a thin quarto volume prepared and published by Mr Disney. He was an avowed Unitarian, and a regular worshipper at the Essex Street Chapel in London. He died September 9, 1804. By him the Hollis estates were bequeathed to John Disney, a Unitarian clergyman.

- ART. V.—1. *Fourth Annual Report to the American Unitarian Association, read and accepted May 26, 1829, with the Addresses at the Annual Meeting.* Boston. Leonard C. Bowles. 1829. 12mo. pp. 50.
2. *The Second Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance. Presented January 28, 1829.* Andover. Flagg & Gould. 1829. 8vo. pp. 64.
3. *First Annual Report of the General Union for Promoting the Observance of the Christian Sabbath, adopted May 12, 1829.* New York. 8vo. pp. 16.

WE have prefixed to this article the titles of several reports of Societies, not so much for the purpose of discussing the merits of the several institutions whose labors they celebrate, as with the more general design of offering some remarks on the disposition, which now prevails, to form Associations, and to accomplish all objects by organized masses. A difference of opinion on this point has begun to manifest itself, and murmurs against the countless Societies which modestly solicit, or authoritatively claim our aid, which now assail us with fair promises of the good which they purpose, and now with rhetorical encomiums on the good they have done, begin to break forth from the judicious and well disposed, as well as from the querulous and selfish. These doubts and complaints, however, are most frequently excited by particular cases of unfair or injurious operations in Societies. As yet, no general principles have been established, by which the value of this mode of action may be determined, or the relative claims of different Associations may be weighed. We will not promise to supply the deficiency, but we hope to furnish some help to a sounder judgment than yet prevails on the subject.

That the subject deserves attention, no man who observes the signs of the times, can doubt. Its importance forces itself on the reflecting. In truth, one of the most remarkable circumstances or features of our age, is the energy with which the principle of combination, or of action by joint forces, by associated numbers, is manifesting itself. It may be said, without much exaggeration, that everything is done now by Societies. Men have learned what wonders can be accomplished in certain cases by union, and seem to think that union is competent to

everything. You can scarcely name an object for which some institution has not been formed. Would men spread one set of opinions, or crush another? They make a Society. Would they improve the penal code, or relieve poor debtors? They make Societies. Would they encourage agriculture, or manufactures, or science? They make Societies. Would one class encourage horse-racing, and another discourage travelling on Sunday? They form Societies. We have immense institutions spreading over the country, combining hosts for particular objects. We have minute ramifications of these Societies, penetrating everywhere except through the poor-house, and conveying resources from the domestic, the laborer, and even the child, to the central treasury. This principle of association is worthy the attention of the philosopher, who simply aims to understand society, and its most powerful springs. To the philanthropist and the Christian it is exceedingly interesting, for it is a mighty engine, and must act, either for good or for evil, to an extent which no man can foresee or comprehend.

It is very easy, we conceive, to explain this great development of the principle of cooperation. The main cause is, the immense facility given to intercourse by modern improvements, by increased commerce and travelling, by the post-office, by the steam-boat, and especially by the press, by newspapers, periodicals, tracts, and other publications. Through these means, men of one mind, through a whole country, easily understand one another, and easily act together. The grand manœuvre to which Napoleon owed his victories, we mean the concentration of great numbers on a single point, is now placed within the reach of all parties and sects. It may be said, that, by facilities of intercourse, men are brought within one another's attraction, and become arranged according to their respective affinities. Those who have one great object, find one another out through a vast extent of country, join their forces, settle their mode of operation, and act together with the uniformity of a disciplined army. So extensive have coalitions become, through the facilities now described, and so various and rapid are the means of communication, that when a few leaders have agreed on an object, an impulse may be given in a month to the whole country. Whole States may be deluged with tracts and other publications, and a voice like that of many waters, be called forth from immense and widely separated multitudes. Here is a new power brought to bear on society, and it is a great



moral question, how it ought to be viewed, and what duties it imposes.

That this mode of action has advantages and recommendations, is very obvious. The principal arguments in its favor may be stated in a few words. Men, it is justly said, can do jointly, what they cannot do singly. The union of minds and hands, works wonders. Men grow efficient by concentrating their powers. Joint effort conquers nature, hews through mountains, rears pyramids, dikes out the ocean. Man, left to himself, living without a fellow, if he could indeed so live, would be one of the weakest of creatures. Associated with his kind, he gains dominion over the strongest animals, over the earth and the sea, and, by his growing knowledge, may be said to obtain a kind of property in the universe.

Nor is this all. Men not only accumulate power by union, but gain warmth, and earnestness. The heart is kindled. An electric communication is established between those who are brought nigh, and bound to each other, in common labors. Man droops in solitude. No sound excites him like the voice of his fellow creature. The mere sight of a human countenance, brightened with strong and generous emotion, gives new strength to act or suffer. Union not only brings to a point forces which before existed, and which were ineffectual through separation, but, by the feeling and interest which it rouses, it becomes a creative principle, calls forth new forces, and gives the mind a consciousness of powers, which would otherwise have been unknown.

We have here given the common arguments by which the disposition to association is justified and recommended. They may be summed up in a few words; namely, that our social principles and relations are the great springs of improvement, and of vigorous and efficient exertion. That there is much truth in this representation of the influences of society, we at once feel. That without impulses and excitements from abroad, without sympathies and communication with our fellow creatures, we should gain nothing and accomplish nothing, we mean not to deny. Still we apprehend, that on this subject there is a want of accurate views and just discrimination. We apprehend that the true use of society is not sufficiently understood; that the chief benefit which it is intended to confer, and the chief danger to which it exposes us, are seldom weighed, and that errors or crude opinions on these points, deprive us of

many benefits of our social connexions. These topics have an obvious bearing on the subject of this article. It is plain that the better we understand the true use, the chief benefit, and the chief peril of our social principles and relations, the better we shall be prepared to judge of Associations which are offered to our patronage. On these topics, then, we propose first to give our views; and, in so doing, we shall allow ourselves a considerable latitude, because, in our judgment, the influences of society at present tend strongly to excess, and especially menace that individuality of character, for which they can yield no adequate compensation.

The great principle, from which we start in this preliminary discussion, and in which all our views of the topics above proposed, are involved, may be briefly expressed. It is this;—Society is chiefly important, as it ministers to, and calls forth, intellectual and moral energy and freedom. Its action on the individual is beneficial, in proportion as it awakens in him a power to act on himself, and to control or withstand the social influences to which he is at first subjected. Society serves us, by furnishing objects, occasions, materials, excitements, through which the whole soul may be brought into vigorous exercise, may acquire a consciousness of its free and responsible nature, may become a law to itself, and may rise to the happiness and dignity of framing and improving itself without limit or end. Inward, creative energy, is the highest good which accrues to us from our social principles and connexions. The mind, is enriched, not by what it passively receives from others, but by its own action on what it receives. We would especially affirm of virtue, that it does not consist in what we inherit, or what comes to us from abroad. It is of inward growth, and it grows by nothing so much as by resistance of foreign influences, by acting from our deliberate convictions, in opposition to the principles of sympathy and imitation. According to these views, our social nature and connexions are means. Inward power is the end; a power which is to triumph over, and control the influence of society.

We are told that we owe to society our most valuable knowledge. And true it is, that, were we cast from birth into solitude, we should grow up in brutal ignorance. But it is also true, that the knowledge which we receive is of little value, any farther than it is food and excitement to intellectual action. Its

worth is to be measured by the energy with which it is sought and employed. Knowledge is noble, in proportion as it is prolific; in proportion as it quickens the mind to the acquisition of higher truth. Let it be rested in passively, and it profits us nothing. Let the judgment of others be our trust, so that we cease to judge for ourselves, and the intellect is degraded into a worthless machine. The dignity of the mind is to be estimated by the energy of its efforts for its own enlargement. It becomes heroic, when it reverences itself and asserts its freedom in a cowardly and servile age; when it withstands society through a calm, but invincible love of truth, and a consciousness of the dignity and progressiveness of its powers.

The indispensable necessity of instruction from our fellow creatures, we in no degree question. But perhaps few are aware how imperfect are the conceptions received from the best instructor, and how much must be done by our own solitary thinking, to give them consistency and vividness. It may be doubted whether a fellow creature can ever impart to us apprehensions of a complex subject, which are altogether just. Be the teacher ever so unerring, his language can hardly communicate his mind with entire precision; for few words awaken exactly the same thoughts in different men. The views which we receive from the most gifted beings, are at best an approximation to truth. We have spoken of unerring teachers; but where are these to be found? Our daily intercourse is with fallible beings, most of whom are undisciplined in intellect, the slaves of prejudice, and unconscious of their own spiritual energies. The essential condition of intellectual progress in such a world, is the resistance of social influences, or of impressions from our fellow beings.

What we have said of intellectual, is still more true of moral progress. No human being exists, whose character can be proposed as a faultless model. But could a perfect individual be found, we should only injure ourselves by indiscriminate, servile imitation; for much which is good in another, is good in him alone, belongs to his peculiar constitution, has been the growth of his peculiar experience, is harmonious and beautiful only in combination with his other attributes, and would be unnatural, awkward, and forced in a servile imitator. The very strength of emotion, which in one man is virtue, in another would be defect; for virtue depends on the balance which exists between the various principles of the soul; and that intenseness of

feeling, which, when joined with force of thought and purpose, is healthful and invigorating, would prove a disease, or might approach insanity, in a weak and sensitive mind. No man should part with his individuality and aim to become another. No process is so fatal as that which would cast all men into one mould. Every human being is intended to have a character of his own, to be what no other is, to do what no other can do. Our common nature is to be unfolded in unbounded diversities. It is rich enough for infinite manifestations. It is to wear innumerable forms of beauty and glory. Every human being has a work to carry on within, duties to perform abroad, influences to exert, which are peculiarly his, and which no conscience but his own can teach. Let him not, then, enslave his conscience to others, but act with the freedom, strength, and dignity of one, whose highest law is in his own breast.

We know that it may be replied to us, that Providence, by placing us at birth in entire subjection to social influences, has marked out society as the great instrument of determining the human mind. The child, it is said, is plainly designed to receive passively and with unresisting simplicity, a host of impressions, thoughts, and feelings, from those around him. This we know. But we know, too, that childhood is not to endure forever. We know that the impressions, pleasures, pains, which throng and possess the infant mind, are intended to awaken in it an energy, by which it is to subject them to itself; by which it is to separate from the crude mass what is true and pure; by which it is to act upon, and modify, and throw into new combinations, the materials forced upon it originally by sensation and society. It is only by putting forth this inward and self-forming power, that we emerge from childhood. He who continues to be passively moulded, prolongs his infancy to the tomb. There is deep wisdom in the declaration of Jesus, that to be his disciples, we must 'hate father and mother;' or, in other words, that we must surrender the prejudices of education to the new lights which God gives us; that the love of truth must triumph over the influences of our best and earliest friends; that, forsaking the maxims of society, we must frame ourselves according to the standard of moral perfection set before us in the life, spirit, and teachings of Jesus Christ. It is interesting to observe how the Creator, who has subjected the child at first to social influences, has even at that age provided for its growing freedom, by inspiring it with an overflowing animation, an inexpressible



joy, an impatience of limits, a thirst for novelty, a delight in adventure, an ardent fancy, all suited to balance the authority of the old, and gradually mingling with the credulity of infancy, that questioning, doubting spirit, on which intellectual progress chiefly depends.

The common opinion is, that our danger from society arises wholly from its bad members, and that we cannot easily be too much influenced by the good. But, to our apprehension, there is a peril in the influence both of good and bad. What many of us have chiefly to dread from society, is, not that we shall acquire a positive character of vice, but that it will impose on us a negative character, that we shall live and die passive beings, that the creative and self-forming energy of the soul will not be called forth in the work of our improvement. Our danger is, that we shall substitute the consciences of others for our own, that we shall paralyze our faculties through dependence on foreign guides, that we shall be moulded from abroad instead of determining ourselves. The pressure of society upon us is constant, and almost immeasurable; now open and direct in the form of authority and menace, now subtle and silent in the guise of blandishment and promise. What mighty power is lodged in a frown or a smile, in the voice of praise and flattery, in scorn or neglect, in public opinion, in domestic habits and prejudices, in the state and spirit of the community to which we belong! Nothing escapes the cognisance of society. Its legislation extends even to our dress, movements, features; and the individual bears the traces, even in countenance, air, and voice, of the social influences amidst which he has been plunged. We are in great peril of growing up slaves to this exacting, arbitrary sovereign; of forgetting, or never learning our true responsibility; of living in unconsciousness of that divine power with which we are invested over ourselves, and in which all the dignity of our nature is concentrated; of overlooking the sacredness of our minds, and laying them open to impressions from any and all who surround us. Resistance of this foreign pressure is our only safeguard, and is essential to virtue. All virtue lies in individual action, in inward energy, in self-determination. There is no moral worth in being swept away by a crowd, even towards the best objects. We must act from an inward spring. The good, as well as the bad, may injure us, if, through that intolerance which is a common infirmity of the good, they impose on us authoritatively their

own convictions, and obstruct our own intellectual and moral activity. A state of society, in which correct habits prevail, may produce in many, a mechanical regularity and religion, which is anything but virtue. Nothing morally great or good springs from mere sympathy and imitation. These principles will only forge chains for us, and perpetuate our infancy, unless more and more controlled and subdued by that inward law-giver and judge, whose authority is from God, and whose sway over our whole nature, alone secures its free, glorious, and everlasting expansion.

The truth is, and we need to feel it most deeply, that our connexion with society, as it is our greatest aid, so it is our greatest peril. We are in constant danger of being spoiled of our moral judgment, and of our power over ourselves; and in losing these, we lose the chief prerogatives of spiritual beings. We sink, as far as mind can sink, into the world of matter, the chief distinction of which is, that it wants self-motion, or moves only from foreign impulse. The propensity in our fellow creatures, which we have most to dread, is that, which, though most severely condemned by Jesus, is yet the most frequent infirmity of his followers; we mean, the propensity to rule, to tyrannize, to war with the freedom of their equals, to make themselves standards for other minds, to be lawgivers instead of brethren and friends to their race. Our great and most difficult duty as social beings, is, to derive constant aid from society without taking its yoke; to open our minds to the thoughts, reasonings, and persuasions of others, and yet to hold fast the sacred right of private judgment; to receive impulses from our fellow beings, and yet to act from our own souls; to sympathize with others, and yet to determine our own feelings; to act with others, and yet to follow our own consciences; to unite social deference and self-dominion; to join moral self-subsistence with social dependence; to respect others without losing self-respect; to love our friends, and to reverence our superiors, whilst our supreme homage is given to that moral perfection which no friend and no superior has realized, and which, if faithfully pursued, will often demand separation from all around us. Such is our great work as social beings, and to perform it, we should look habitually to Jesus Christ, who was distinguished by nothing more than by moral independence, than by resisting and overcoming the world.

The reverence for our own moral nature, on which we have

have now insisted, needs earnest and perpetual inculcation. This virtue finds few aids from abroad. All religions and governments have more or less warred with it. Even that religion which came from God to raise man to a moral empire over himself, has been seized on by the selfish and intolerant principles of human nature, and all its sanctions been brought to bear against that free, independent action of thought and conscience, which it was chiefly intended to promote. In truth, men need to be instructed in nothing more than in what they owe to their own spiritual faculties. The sacredness of the moral principle in every human breast; its divine right of dominion; the jealousy with which it ought to be protected against our own passions, and the usurpations of society; the watchful care with which it should be unfolded, refined, and fortified, by communion with ourselves, with great and good minds, with that brightest manifestation of God, Jesus Christ, and with God himself; the awe with which its deliberate dictates should be heard; the energy which it may, and should put forth in opposition to pleasure and pain, to human frowns or smiles; the sublime tranquillity to which it may ascend; the conscious union with God which it may attain, and through which it seems to partake of his omnipotence; these prerogatives of the moral nature, of that element and spark of Divinity in the soul, are almost forgotten in the condition of servitude to which the multitude are reduced by the joint tyranny of the passions and of society.

It is interesting and encouraging to observe, that the enslaving power of society over the mind, is decreasing, through what would seem at first to threaten its enlargement; we mean, through the extension of social intercourse. This is a distinction of our age, and one of its chief means of improvement. Men are widening their bounds, exchanging thoughts and feelings with fellow beings far and wide, with inhabitants of other countries, with subjects of other governments, with professors of other modes of faith. Distant nations are brought near, and are acting on one another with a new power; and the result is, that these differing and often hostile influences balance or neutralize one another, and almost compel the intellect to act, to compare, to judge, to frame itself. This we deem an immense benefit of the multiplication of books at the present day. The best books contain errors, and deserve a very limited trust. But wherever men of thought and genius publish freely, they will

perpetually send forth new views, to keep alive the intellectual action of the world; will give a frequent shock to received opinions; will lead men to contemplate great subjects from new positions, and, by thus awakening individual and independent energy, will work higher good than by the knowledge which they spread. The same effect is to be anticipated from the study of different languages, which occupies more and more space in our systems of education; and we believe this to be the happiest effect. A great man used to say, that in learning a new language, he had gained a new soul, so fresh and original were the views which it opened to him. A new language, considered in itself, or without reference to the writings which it contains, seems to us a valuable possession, on account of the new combinations of thought which its vocabulary presents; and when regarded as the key to the minds of a people, whose institutions, education, climate, temperament, religion, and history, differ from our own, and in whom, of consequence, our common nature is taking a new form, it is, to one who has power to understand its use, an invaluable acquisition. In truth, we cannot express too strongly the importance we attach to an enlarged intercourse with other minds, considered as the means of freeing and quickening our own. This is the chief good of extensive institutions for education. They place us under diversified social influences; connect us with the dead as well as with the living; accumulate for us the thoughts of all ages and nations; take us out of the narrow circle of a neighbourhood, or church, or community; make us fellow citizens with the friends of truth under the whole heaven, and, through these various and often hostile influences, aid and encourage us to that independent moral judgment, and intellectual discrimination, by which our views are more and more purified and enlarged.

We regret that religion has not done more to promote this enlarged intercourse of minds, the great means, as we have seen, of reconciling social aids with personal independence. As yet, religion has generally assumed a sectarian form, and its disciples, making narrowness a matter of conscience, have too often shunned connexion with men of different views as a pestilence, and yielded their minds to the exclusive influences of the leaders and teachers of their separate factions. Indeed, we fear that in no department of life has the social principle been perverted more into an instrument of intellectual thralldom, than in religion. We could multiply proofs without end, but will



content ourselves with a single illustration drawn from what are called 'revivals of religion.' We have many objections to these as commonly conducted; but nothing offends us more than their direct and striking tendency to overwhelm the mind with foreign influences, and to strip it of all self-direction. In these feverish seasons, religion, or what bears the name, is spread as by contagion, and to escape it is almost as difficult as to avoid a raging epidemic. Whoever knows anything of human nature, knows the effect of excitement in a crowd. When systematically prolonged and urged onward, it subverts deliberation and self-control. The individual is lost in the mass, and borne away as in a whirlwind. The prevalent emotion, be it love or hatred, terror or enthusiasm, masters every mind, which is not fortified by a rare energy, or secured by a rare insensibility. In revivals, a multitude are subjected at once to strong emotions, which are swelled and perpetuated by the most skilful management. The individual is never suffered to escape the grasp of the leading or subordinate agents in the work.\* A machinery of social influences, of 'inquiry meetings,' of 'anxious meetings,' of conferences, of prayer meetings, of perpetual private or public impulses, is brought to bear on the diseased subject, until, exhausted in body and mind, he becomes the passive, powerless recipient of whatever form or impressions it may be thought fit to give him. Happily for mankind, our nature loses its sensibility to perpetual stimulants, and of consequence a revival is succeeded by what is called 'a dull, dead, stupid season.' This dull time is a merciful repose granted by Providence to the overwrought and oppressed mind, and gives some chance for calm, deliberate, individual thought and action. Thus the kindness of nature is perpetually counterworking the excesses of men, and a religion, which begins in partial insanity, is often seen to attain by degrees to the calmness and dignity of reason.

In the preceding remarks we have stated, at greater length than we intended, our views of the true and highest benefits of

\* We recollect seeing the following direction gravely given for managing revivals, in the book of a minister experienced in this work. 'Be careful never to kindle more fires than you can tend.' In other words, Do not awaken and alarm more persons than you can place under constant inspection, and beset with perpetual excitements. What a strange rule for persons who profess to believe that these 'fires' are 'kindled' supernaturally by the Holy Spirit!

society. These seem to us great, unspeakably great. At the same time, like all other goods, they are accompanied with serious perils. Society too often oppresses the energy which it was meant to quicken and exalt.—We now pass to our principal subject; to the Associations for public purposes, whether benevolent, moral, or religious, which are so multiplied in the present age. And here we must confine ourselves to two remarks; the first intended to assign to such Associations their proper place or rank, and the second, to suggest a principle, by which useful Societies may be distinguished from such as are pernicious, and by which we may be aided in distributing among them our favor and patronage.

Our first remark is, that we should beware of confounding together, as of equal importance, those associations which are formed by our Creator, which spring from our very constitution, and are inseparable from our being, and those of which we are now treating, which man invents for particular times and exigences. Let us never place our weak, shortsighted contrivances on a level with the arrangements of God. We have acknowledged the infinite importance of society to the development of human powers and affections. But when we speak thus of society, we mean chiefly the relations in which God has placed us; we mean the connexions of family, of neighbourhood, of country, and the great bond of humanity, uniting us with our whole kind, and not Missionary Societies, Peace Societies, or Charitable Societies, which men have contrived. These last have their uses, and some do great good; but they are no more to be compared with the societies in which nature places us, than the torches which we kindle on earth in the darkness of night, are to be paralleled with the all-pervading and all-glorifying light of the sun. We make these remarks, because nothing is more common than for men to forget the value of what is familiar, natural, and universal, and to ascribe undue importance to what is extraordinary, forced, and rare, and therefore striking. Artificial associations have their use, but are not to be named with those of nature; and to these last, therefore, we are to give our chief regard.

We can easily illustrate, by examples, the inferiority of human associations. In Boston, there are two Asylums for children, which deserve, we think, a high place among useful institutions. Not a little time is spent upon them. Hundreds conspire to carry them on, and we have anniversaries to collect

crowds for their support. And what is the amount of good accomplished? Between one or two hundred children are provided for, a number worthy of all the care bestowed on these charities. But compare this number with all the children of this city, with the thousands who throng our streets, and our schools. And how are these fed, clothed, educated? We hear of no subscriptions, no anniversaries for their benefit; yet how they flourish, compared with the subjects of Asylums! These are provided for by that unostentatious and unpraised society, which God has instituted, a family. That shelter, home, which nature rears, protects them, and it is an establishment worth infinitely more than all the institutions, great or small, which man has devised. In truth, just as far as this is improved, as its duties are performed, and its blessings prized, all artificial institutions are superseded. Here then is the sphere for the agency of the wise and good. Improve the family, strengthen and purify the relations of domestic life, and more is done for the happiness and progress of the race, than by the most splendid charities.—Let us take another example, the Hospital in the same metropolis; a noble institution, worthy of high praise. But where is it that the sick of our city are healed? Must you look for them in the Hospital? You may find there perhaps, and should rejoice to find there, fifty or sixty beds for the poor. The thousands who sicken and die among us, are to be found in their homes, watched over by the nursing care of mothers and sisters, surrounded by that tenderness which grows up only at home.—Let us take another example, Missionary Societies. This whole country is thrown into excitement to support missions. The rich are taxed, and the poor burdened. We do not say that they are burdened without object; for Christianity is so infinite a blessing, that we consent to any honest methods of sending it abroad. But what is the amount of good effected? A few missionaries, we know not the precise number, are supported, of whom most have hitherto brought little to pass. Who can compare associations for this object, with churches, or those congregations of neighbours for regular worship, which Christianity has instituted, and to which nature has always prompted the professors of the same faith? Through these, incalculable aid is given to the support and diffusion of Christianity; and yet, through the propensity of human nature to exaggerate what is forced and artificial, one missionary at a distance is thought of more importance than a hundred ministers near, and the sending of him

abroad is extolled as an incomparably greater exploit of piety, than the support of our own places of worship. We mean not to discourage Missionary Societies; but the truth is, that Christianity is to be diffused incomparably more by caring for and promoting it in our natural relations, in our homes, in our common circles and churches, than by institutions endowed with the revenues of nations for sending it to distant lands. The great obstruction to Christianity among foreign nations, is, its inoperativeness among the nations which profess it. We offer others a religion, which, in their apprehension, has done the givers no great good. The true course is, to rely less on our own machinery of Cent Societies and National Societies, and to rely more on the connexions and arrangements of nature, or of God.

We beg not to be misunderstood. We would on no account discourage the Asylum, the Hospital, the Missionary Society. All receive our cheerful support. We only mean to say, that our great sources of improvement and happiness, are our natural relations and associations, and that to understand these better, and to attach ourselves more faithfully to their duties, are the great social means of carrying forward the world. A striking confirmation of these remarks may be found in the Romish Church. The probability is, that under the Catholic religion in the dark ages, there were larger contributions to the relief of the distressed, in proportion to the wealth of communities, than at present, and contributions by associations which regarded almsgiving as one of their main duties; we mean the monasteries. But the monks, who quitted the relations of nature, the society which God had instituted, in order to form new and artificial bonds, more favorable,\* as they thought, to doing good, made a sad mistake. Their own characters were injured, and the very charities doled out from convents, increased the beggary which they hoped to relieve. So sacred is nature, that it cannot be trampled on with impunity. We fear that something similar to the error just noticed among Catholics, is spreading among Protestants; the error of exalting societies of human device above our natural relations. We have been told that cases occur among us, and are not rare, in which domestic claims on kindness are set aside for the sake of making contributions to our great Societies, and especially to foreign missions. So possessed are the minds of multitudes with the supreme importance of this object, that there



seems to them a piety in withholding what would otherwise have been thought due to a poor relative, that it may be sent across oceans to pagan lands. We have heard that delicate kindnesses, which once flowed from the more prosperous to the less prosperous members of a large family, and which bound society together by that love which is worth all bonds, are diminished since the late excitement in favor of the heathen. And this we do not wonder at. In truth, we rather wonder that anything is done for the temporal comfort of friends, where the doctrine on which modern missions chiefly rest, is believed. We refer to the doctrine, that the whole heathen world are on the brink of a bottomless and endless hell; that thousands every day, and millions every year, are sinking into this abyss of torture and wo; and that nothing can save them but sending them our religion. We see not how they who so believe, can give their families or friends, a single comfort, much less an ornament, of life. They must be strongly tempted, one would think, to stint themselves and their dependents to necessities, and to cast their whole remaining substance into the treasury of Missionary Societies.

We repeat it, let us not be misunderstood. Missionary Societies, established on just principles, do honor to a christian community. We regard them with any feeling but that of hostility. The readers of this work cannot have forgotten the earnestness with which we recommended the support of a mission in India, at a time when we thought that peculiar circumstances invited exertion in that quarter. We only oppose the preference of these institutions to the natural associations and connexions of life. An individual who thinks that he is doing a more religious act in contributing to a Missionary Society, than in doing a needful act of kindness to a relative, friend, or neighbour, is leaving a society of God's institution, for one of man's making. He shows a perverted judgment in regard to the duties of his religion, and in regard to the best means of spreading it. All that has been done, or ever will or can be done by Associations for diffusing Christianity, is a mere drop of the bucket, compared with what is done silently, and secretly, by the common daily duties of Christians in their families, neighbourhoods, and business. The surest way of spreading Christianity, is, to improve christian communities; and accordingly, he who frees this religion from corruption, and makes it a more powerful instrument of virtue where it is already professed, is the most effectual contributor to the great work of its diffusion through the world.

We now proceed to our second remark, in which we proposed to suggest a principle, by which the claims of different Associations may be estimated. It is this ;—The value of Associations is to be measured by the energy, the freedom, the activity, the moral power, which they encourage and diffuse. In truth, the great object of all benevolence, is, to give power, activity, and freedom to others. We cannot, in the strict sense of the word, *make* any being happy. We can give others the *means* of happiness, together with motives to the faithful use of them ; but on this faithfulness, on the free and full exercise of their own powers, their happiness depends. There is thus a fixed, impassable limit to human benevolence. It can only make men happy through themselves, through their own freedom, and energy. We go further. We believe, that God has set the same limit to his own benevolence. He makes no being happy, in any other sense than in that of giving him means, powers, motives, and a field for exertion. We have here, we think, the great consideration to guide us in judging of Associations. Those are good which communicate power, moral and intellectual action, and the capacity of useful efforts, to the persons who form them, or to the persons on whom they act. On the other hand, Associations which in any degree impair or repress the free and full action of men's powers, are so far hurtful. On this principle, Associations for restoring to men health, strength, the use of their limbs, the use of their senses, especially of sight and hearing, are highly to be approved, for such enlarge men's powers ; whilst charitable Associations, which weaken in men the motives to exertion, which offer a bounty to idleness, or make beggary as profitable as labor, are great calamities to society, and peculiarly calamitous to those whom they relieve. On the same principle, Associations which are designed to awaken the human mind, to give to men of all classes a consciousness of their intellectual powers, to communicate knowledge of a useful and quickening character, to encourage men in thinking with freedom and vigor, to inspire an ardent love and pursuit of truth,—are most worthy of patronage ; whilst such as are designed or adapted to depress the human intellect, to make it dependent and servile, to keep it where it is, to give a limited amount of knowledge, but not to give impulse and an onward motion to men's thoughts,—all such Associations, however benevolent their professions, should be regarded as among the foes and obstructions to the best interests of society. On the same

principle, Associations aiming to purify and ennoble the character of a people, to promote true virtue, a rational piety, a disinterested charity, a wise temperance, and especially aiming to accomplish these ends by the only effectual means, that is, by calling forth men's own exertions for a higher knowledge of God and duty, and for a new and growing control of themselves,—such institutions are among the noblest; whilst no encouragement is due to such as aim to make men religious and virtuous by paralyzing their minds through terror, by fastening on them a yoke of opinions or practices, by pouring upon them influences from abroad which virtually annihilate their power over themselves, and make them instruments for others to speak through, and to wield at pleasure. We beg our readers to carry with them the principle now laid down in judging of Associations; to inquire, how far they are fitted to call forth energy, active talent, religious inquiry, a free and manly virtue. We insist on these remarks, because not a few Associations seem to us exceedingly exceptionable on account of their tendency to fetter men, to repress energy, to injure the free action of individuals and society, and because this tendency lurks, and is to be guarded against, even in good institutions. On this point we cannot but enlarge; for we deem it of highest importance.

Associations often injure free action by a very plain and obvious operation. They accumulate power in a few hands, and this takes place just in proportion to the surface over which they spread. In a large institution, a few men rule, a few do everything; and if the institution happens to be directed to objects about which conflict and controversy exist, a few are able to excite in the mass strong and bitter passions, and by these to obtain an immense ascendancy. Through such an Association, widely spread, yet closely connected by party feeling, a few leaders can send their voices and spirit far and wide, and, where great funds are accumulated, can league a host of instruments, and by menace and appeals to interest, can silence opposition. Accordingly, we fear that in this country, an influence is growing up through widely spread Societies, altogether at war with the spirit of our institutions, and which, unless jealously watched, will gradually but surely encroach on freedom of thought, of speech, and of the press. It is very striking to observe, how, by such combinations, the very means of encouraging a free action of men's minds, may be turned against it. We all esteem the press as the safeguard of our lib-

erties, as the power which is to quicken intellect by giving to all minds an opportunity to act on all. Now by means of Tract Societies, spread over a whole community, and acting under a central body, a few individuals, perhaps not more than twenty, may determine the chief reading for a great part of the children of the community, and for a majority of the adults, and may deluge our country with worthless sectarian writings, fitted only to pervert its taste, degrade its intellect, and madden it with intolerance. Let Associations devoted to any objects which excite the passions, be everywhere spread and leagued together for mutual support, and nothing is easier than to establish a control over newspapers. We are persuaded that by an artful multiplication of Societies, devoted apparently to different objects, but all swayed by the same leaders, and all intended to bear against a hated party, as cruel a persecution may be carried on in a free country as in a despotism. Public opinion may be so combined, and inflamed, and brought to bear on odious individuals or opinions, that it will be as perilous to think and speak with manly freedom, as if an Inquisition were open before us. It is now discovered that the way to rule in this country, is by an array of numbers, which a prudent man will not like to face. Of consequence, all Associations aiming or tending to establish sway by numbers, ought to be opposed. They create tyrants as effectually as standing armies. Let them be withstood from the beginning. No matter whether the opinions which they intend to put down be true or false. Let no opinion be put down by such means. Let not error be suppressed by an instrument, which will be equally powerful against truth, and which must subvert that freedom of thought on which all truth depends. Let the best end fail, if it cannot be accomplished by right and just means. For example, we would have criminals punished, but punished in the proper way, and by a proper authority. It were better that they should escape, than be imprisoned or executed by any man who may think fit to assume the office; for sure we are, that by this summary justice, the innocent would soon suffer more than the guilty; and on the same principle, we cannot consent that what we deem error should be crushed by the joint cries and denunciations of vast Societies directed by the tyranny of a few; for truth has more to dread from such weapons than falsehood, and we know no truth against which they may not be successfully turned. In this country, few things are more to be dread-



ed, than organizations or institutions by which public opinion may be brought to bear tyrannically against individuals or sects. From the nature of things, public opinion is often unjust; but when it is not embodied and fixed by pledged Societies, it easily relents, it may receive new impulses, it is open to influences from the injured. On the contrary, when shackled and stimulated by vast Associations, it is in danger of becoming a steady, unrelenting tyrant, browbeating the timid, proscribing the resolute, silencing free speech, and virtually denying the dearest religious and civil rights. We say not that all great Associations *must* be thus abused. We know that some are useful. We know, too, that there are cases, in which it is important that public opinion should be condensed, or act in a mass. We feel, however, that the danger of great Associations is increased by the very fact, that they are sometimes useful. They are perilous instruments. They ought to be suspected. They are a kind of irregular government created within our Constitutional government. Let them be watched closely. As soon as we find them resolved or disposed to bear down a respectable man or set of men, or to force on the community measures about which wise and good men differ, let us feel that a dangerous engine is at work among us, and oppose to it our steady and stern disapprobation.

We have spoken of the tendency of great institutions to accumulate power in a few hands. These few they make more active; but they tend to produce dependence, and to destroy self-originated action in the vast multitudes who compose them, and this is a serious injury. Few comprehend the extent of this evil. Individual action is the highest good. What we want, is, that men should do right more and more from their own minds, and less and less from imitation, from a foreign impulse, from sympathy with a crowd. This is the kind of action which we recommend. Would you do good according to the gospel? Do it secretly, silently; so silently that the left hand will not know what the right hand doeth. This precept does not favor the clamorous and far published efforts of a leagued multitude. We mean not to sever men from others in well-doing, for we have said there are many good objects which can only be accomplished by numbers. But generally speaking, we can do most good by individual action, and our own virtue is incomparably more improved by it. It is vastly better, for example, that we should give our own money with our own hands, from our own

judgment, and through personal interest in the distresses of others, than that we should send it by a substitute. Second-hand charity is not as good to the giver or receiver as immediate. There are, indeed, urgent cases where we cannot act immediately, or cannot alone do the good required. There let us join with others; but where we can do good secretly, and separately, or only with some dear friend, we shall almost certainly put forth in this way more of intellect and heart, more of sympathy and strenuous purpose, and shall awaken more of virtuous sensibility in those whom we relieve, than if we were to be parts of a multitude in accomplishing the same end. Individual action is the great point to be secured. That man alone understands the true use of society, who learns from it to act more and more from his own deliberate conviction, to think more for himself, to be less swayed by numbers, to rely more on his own powers. One good action, springing from our own minds, performed from a principle within, performed without the excitement of an urging and approving voice from abroad, is worth more than hundreds which grow from mechanical imitation, or from the heat and impulse which numbers give us. In truth, all great actions are solitary ones. All the great works of genius come from deep, lonely thought. The writings which have quickened, electrified, regenerated the human mind, did not spring from Associations. That is most valuable which is individual; which is marked by what is peculiar and characteristic in him who accomplishes it. In truth, Associations are chiefly useful by giving means and opportunities to gifted individuals to act out their own minds. A Missionary Society achieves little good, except when it can send forth an individual who wants no teaching or training from the Society, but who carries his commission and chief power in his own soul. We urge this, for we feel that we are all in danger of sacrificing our individuality and independence to our social connexions. We dread new social trammels. They are too numerous already. From these views we learn, that there is cause to fear and to withstand great Associations, as far as they interfere with, or restrain individual action, personal independence, private judgment, free, self-originated effort. We do fear, from not a few Associations which exist, that power is to be accumulated in the hands of a few, and a servile, tame, dependent spirit, to be generated in the many. Such is the danger of our times, and we are bound as Christians and free-men to withstand it.

We have now laid down the general principles, which, as we think, are to be applied to Associations for public objects. Another part of our work remains. We propose to offer some remarks on a few Societies, which at this time demand our patronage, or excite particular attention. In doing this, we shall speak with our customary freedom; but we beg that we may not be understood as censuring the motives of those whose plans and modes of operation we condemn.

The Associations for Suppressing Intemperance form an interesting feature of our times. Their object is of undoubted utility, and unites the hearts of all good men. They aim to suppress an undoubted and gross vice, to free its victims from the worst bondage, to raise them from brutal degradation to the liberty and happiness of men. There is one strong presumption in favor of the means which they have used. We have never heard of their awakening enmity and counteraction. In one particular some of them may have erred. We refer to the compact formed by their members for abstaining from wine. When we consider, that wine is universally acknowledged to be an innocent, and often salutary beverage, that Jesus sanctioned its use by miraculously increasing it at the marriage feast, that the scriptures teach us to thank God for it as a good gift, intended to 'gladden the heart of man,' and when to these considerations we add, that wine countries are distinguished for temperance, we are obliged to regard this pledge as injudicious; and we regret it, because it may bring distrust and contempt on an excellent institution, and because its abandonment, for it cannot long continue, may be construed by some as a warrant for returning to inebriating liquors. In one view, the success of the efforts against intemperance affords us peculiar satisfaction. It demonstrates a truth, little felt, but infinitely precious; namely, the recoverableness of human nature from the lowest depths of vice. It teaches us never to despair of a human being. It teaches us, that there is always something to work on, a germ to be unfolded, a spark which may be cherished, in the human soul. Intemperance is the most hopeless state into which a man can fall; and yet, instances of recovery from this vice have rewarded the recent labors of the philanthropist. Let philanthropy then rejoice in the belief, that the capacity of improvement is never lost, and let it convert this conviction into new and more strenuous efforts for the recovery of the most depraved.

We proceed now to Bible Societies. These need no advocates. Their object is so simple, unexceptionable, beneficent, that all Protestants, at least, concur in their support. By spreading the bible without note or comment, they especially assert the right of private judgment, and are thus free from the great reproach of trenching on christian freedom. Perhaps they have not always been conducted with sufficient prudence. We have particularly feared, that they might be open to the charge of indiscreet profusion. We believe it to be a good rule, that where the poor can give anything for a bible, no matter how little, they should be encouraged and incited to pay this part of the price. We believe, that it will be more valued, and more carefully preserved, where it has cost something. We do not think of the bible, as the superstitious among Catholics and heathens do of relics and charms, as if its mere presence in a family were a necessary good. We wish some pledge that it will be treated with respect, and we fear that this respect has been diminished by the lavishness with which it has been bestowed. One cause of the evil is, that Societies, like individuals, have a spice of vanity, and love to make a fair show in their annual reports; and accordingly they are apt to feel as if a favor were conferred, when their books are taken off their hands. We think that to secure respect to the bible is even more important than to distribute it widely. For this purpose, its exterior should be attractive. It should be printed in a fair, large type, should be well bound, and be provided with a firm case. This last provision seems to us especially important. The poor have no book-cases. Their bibles too often lie on the same shelves with their domestic utensils; nor can it be doubted, that when soiled, torn, dishonored by this exposure, they are regarded with less respect, than if protected with peculiar care.

We have a still more important remark to make in reference to Bible Societies. In our last number, we noticed an edition of the New Testament recently published in Boston, and differing from those in common use, by a new translation of those passages of the Greek original, of which the true reading was lost or neglected when the received English version was made. This edition of the New Testament we stated to be *undoubtedly* more correct, more conformed to the original, than our common editions. On this point we speak strongly, because we wish to call to it the attention of Bible Societies, and of all conscientious



Christians. To such we say,—Here is a translation, undoubtedly more faithful to the original than that in common use. You have here in greater purity what Jesus Christ said, and what his apostles wrote; and if so, you are bound by your allegiance to Christ to substitute this for the common translation. We know, that uneducated Christians cannot settle this question. We therefore respectfully, and with solemnity, solicit for it the attention of learned men, of christian ministers, of professors of theology of every sect and name. We ask for the calmest and most deliberate investigation; and if, as we believe, there shall be but one opinion as to the claims of the version which we have recommended; if all must acknowledge that it renders more faithfully the words of the inspired and authorised teachers of Christianity, then we see not how it can be denied the reception and diffusion which it deserves. We conceive, that, to Bible Societies, this is a great question, and not to be evaded without unfaithfulness to our common Master, and without disrespect to the holy scriptures. We fear that there is a want of conscientiousness on this subject. We fear that the British and Foreign Bible Society has forfeited, in a measure, its claims to the gratitude and admiration of the church, by neglecting to secure the greatest possible accuracy and fidelity to the new translations which they have sent forth. We hear continual expressions of reverence for the bible; but the most unambiguous proofs of it, we mean, unwearied efforts to purify it from human additions, mutilations, and corruptions, remain to be given.

Before leaving the consideration of Bible Societies, we cannot but refer to a very singular transaction in relation to the scriptures, in which some of them are thought to be implicated. In some of our cities and villages, we are told, that the rich as well as the poor have been visited for the purpose of ascertaining whether they own the bible. The object of this domiciliary investigation we profess not to understand. We cannot suppose, that it was intended to lavish on the rich the funds which were contributed for spreading the scriptures among the poor. One thing we know, that a measure more likely to irritate and to be construed into an insult, could not easily be contrived. As a sign of the times, it deserves our notice. After this step, it ought not to surprise us should an Inquisition be established, to ascertain who among us observe, and who neglect the duties of private and family prayer. We might smile at this spirit, could we tell where it would stop. But it is essentially prying, restless and encroaching, and its first movements ought to be withstood.

We now proceed to another class of Associations; those which are designed to promote the Observance of the Sabbath. The motives which gave birth to these, we respect. But we doubt the rectitude and usefulness of the object, and we fear that what has begun in conscientiousness may end in intolerance and oppression. We cannot say of these Associations, as of those which we have just noticed, that they aim at an unquestionable good, about which all good men agree. Not a few of the wisest and best men dissent from the principle on which these Societies are built; namely, that the Jewish sabbath is binding on Christians. Not a few of the profoundest divines and most exemplary followers of Christ, have believed and still believe, that the sabbath enjoined in the fourth commandment, is a part of Judaism, and not of the gospel; that it is essentially different from the Lord's-day, and that to enforce it on Christians, is to fall into that error which Paul withstood even unto death, the error of adulterating Christianity by mixtures of a preparatory and very inferior religion.

We beg to be understood. All Christians, whom we know, concur in the opinion and the desire, that the Lord's-day, or the first day of the week, should be separated to the commemoration of Christ's resurrection, to public worship, to public christian instruction, and in general to what are called the means of religion. This we gratefully accept and honor as a christian rite. But not a few believe that the Lord's-day and the ancient sabbath are not the same institution, and ought not to be confounded; that the former is of a nobler character, and more important than the latter, and that the mode of observing it is to be determined by the spirit and purposes of Christianity, and not by any preceding law. This is a question about which Christians have differed for ages. We certainly wish that it may be debated, till it is settled. But we grieve to see a questionable doctrine made the foundation of large Societies, and to see Christians leagued to pass the sentence of irreligion on men equally virtuous with themselves, and who perhaps better understand the mind of Christ in regard to the sabbath.

We know that it is confidently affirmed, that God, at an earlier period than the Jewish law, enjoined the sabbath as a perpetual, universal, irrevocable law for the whole human race. But can this position be sustained? For ourselves, we cannot see a trace of it in the scriptures, those only sure records of God's revela-

tion to mankind. We do indeed incline to believe, what many wise men have questioned, that there are appearances of the institution of the sabbath at the beginning of the human race. We know that these are faint and few; yet we attach importance to them, because nature and reason favor the supposition of a time having been set apart from the first as a religious memorial. Whilst, however, we incline to this view as most probable, we see no proofs of the perpetuity of the institution in the circumstance of its early origin. On the contrary, an ordinance or rite, given in the infancy of the human race, may be presumed to be temporary, unless its unchangeableness is expressly taught, or is necessarily implied in its very nature. The positive or ritual religion, which was adapted to the earlier, can hardly suit the maturer periods of the race. Man is a progressive being, and needs a progressive religion. It is one of the most interesting and beautiful features of the sacred writings, and one of the strong evidences of their truth, that they reveal religion as a growing light, and manifest the Divine Legislator as adapting himself to the various and successive conditions of the world. Allowing then the sabbath to have been given to Adam, we could no more infer its perpetuity, than we can infer the perpetuity of capital punishment, as an ordinance of God, because he said to Noah, the second parent of the human race, 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.'

Our opinion leans, as we have said, to the early institution of the sabbath; but we repeat it, the presumptions on which our judgments rest are too uncertain to authorise confidence, much less denunciation. The greater part of the early Fathers of the Church, according to Calmet, believed that the law of the sabbath was not given before Moses; and this, as we have observed, is the opinion of some of the most judicious and pious Christians of later times. Whilst disposed to differ from these, we feel that the subject is to be left to the calm decision of individuals. We want no array of numbers to settle a doubtful question. One thing is plain, that before Moses, not one precept is given in relation to the sabbath, nor a hint of its unchangeableness to the end of the world. One thing is plain, that the question of the perpetuity of this institution is to be settled by the teachings of Jesus Christ, the great prophet, who alone is authorised to determine how far the institutions of religion which preceded him, are binding on his followers. For ourselves, we are followers of Christ, and not of Moses, or Noah, or Adam. We call ourselves Chris-

tians, and the gospel is our only rule. Nothing in the Old Testament binds us, any further than it is recognised by, or incorporated into the New. The great and only question, then, is, Does the New Testament, does Christianity, impose on us the ancient sabbath?

To aid us in settling this question, we may first inquire into the nature and design of this institution; and nothing can be plainer. Words cannot make it clearer. According to the Old Testament, the seventh, or last day of the week, was to be set apart, or sanctified, as a day of rest, in commemoration of God's having rested on that day from the work of creation.\* The distinguishing feature of the institution, is *rest*. The word sabbath means rest. The event to be commemorated was rest. The reason for selecting the seventh, was, that this had been to the Creator a day of rest. The chief method prescribed for sanctifying the day was rest. The distinctive character of the institution could not have been more clearly expressed. Whoever reads the fourth commandment, will see, that no mode of setting apart the day to God, is there prescribed, except an imitation of his rest. How far this constituted the sanctification of the sabbath, will be seen from such passages as the following. 'You shall keep the sabbath, for it is holy unto you. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death. For whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people.'† A still more remarkable proof, that the sanctification of the sabbath consisted in resting after the example of God, is furnished by Christ, who says, that 'on the sabbath days the priests in the Temple *profane* the sabbath.'‡ So essential was rest to the hallowing of the day, that the work of offering victims, though prescribed by God himself, is said to

\* We beg our readers to observe, that we are now simply stating the account of the sabbath which is given in the Old Testament. How this account is to be interpreted, is a question not involved in our present subject. We would however observe, that the rest here ascribed to God must be understood in a figurative sense. Properly speaking, God, who is incapable of fatigue, and whose almighty agency is unceasing, never rests. In finishing the work of creation, he did not sink into repose, or for a moment desist from the exercise of his omnipotence. A particular mode of his agency was discontinued; and, in accommodation to an uncultivated age, this discontinuance was called rest. It seems to us, that the sabbath bears one mark of a temporary institution, in the fact of its being founded on a representation of God, which is true only in a figurative or popular sense, and which gives something like a shock to a mind, which has exalted its conceptions of the Divinity. Such an institution does not carry the impress of a perpetual and universal law.

† Exod. xxxi. 14, also Jer. xvii. 22.

‡ Matt. xii. 5.



profane it. There are indeed some expressions of Moses, indicating other methods of observing the day, for he calls it 'a holy convocation;' but whether this phrase applies to other places besides the Temple, is uncertain. It is not improbable, indeed, that the people resorted to the Levites and prophets on the sabbath rather than other days; but we find no precept to this effect; and it is well known that no synagogues or places of worship were built, through Judea, until after the captivity. Rest, then, was the great distinction of the day. This constituted it a memorial, and gave it its name; and we conceive that the chief stress was laid on this circumstance, because the sabbath was intended to answer a humane, as well as religious end; that is, to give relief to persons in servitude, and to inferior animals, a provision very much needed in an unrefined and semi-barbarous age, when slavery had no acknowledged rights, and when little mercy was shown to man or beast. In conformity to these views, we find the Jewish nation always regarding the sabbath as a joyful day, a festival. In the time of Christ, we find him bidden to a feast on the sabbath day, and accepting the invitation,\* and our impression is, that now, as in past times, the Jews divide the day between the synagogue and social enjoyment.

The nature and end of the sabbath cannot be easily misunderstood. It was the seventh or last day of the week, set apart by God as a day of rest, in imitation and in commemoration of his having rested on that day from the creation. That other religious observances were with great propriety introduced into the day, and that they were multiplied with the progress of the nation, we do not doubt. But the distinctive observance, and the only one expressly enjoined on the whole people, was rest. Now we ask, Is the dedication of the seventh or last day of the week to rest, in remembrance of God's resting on that day, a part of the christian religion? The answer seems to us plain. We affirm, in the first place, what none will contradict, that this institution is not enjoined in the New Testament, even by the faintest hint or implication; and in the next place, we maintain that the christian world, so far from finding it there, have by their practice disowned its authority.

This last position may startle some of our readers. But it is not therefore less true. We maintain that the christian world have in practice disowned the obligation of the sabbath estab-

\* Luke, xiv.

lished by the fourth commandment. There is indeed a body of Christians, called Sabbatarians, who strictly and religiously observe the fourth commandment. But they are a handful; they are lost, swallowed up in the immense majority of Christians, who have for ages ceased to observe the sabbath prescribed from Sinai. True, Christians have their sacred day, which they call a sabbath. But is it in truth the ancient sabbath? We say, no; and we call attention to this point. The ancient sabbath, as we have seen, was the last day of the week, set apart for rest, in commemoration of God's resting on that day. And is the first day of the week a day observed in remembrance of Christ's resurrection from the dead, the same institution with this? Can broader marks between two ordinances be conceived? Is it possible that they can be confounded? Is not the ancient sabbath renounced by the christian world? Have we not thus the testimony of the christian world to its having passed away? Who of us can consistently plead for it as a universal and perpetual law?

We know, that it is said, that the ancient sabbath remains untouched; that Christianity has only removed it from the last to the first day of the week, and that this is a slight, unessential change, leaving the old institution whole and unbroken. To this we have several replies. In the first place this change of days, which Christianity is supposed to make, is not unessential, but vital, and subversive of the ancient institution. The end of the ancient sabbath was the commemoration of God's resting from his works, and for this end, the very day of the week on which he rested, was most wisely selected. Now we maintain, that to select the first day of the week, the very day on which he began his works, and to select and separate this in commemoration of another event, of Christ's resurrection, is wholly to set aside the ancient sabbath. We cannot conceive of a more essential departure from the original ordinance. This substitution, as it is called, is a literal as well as virtual abolition. Such is our first remark.—We say secondly, that not a word is uttered in the New Testament of the first day being substituted for the seventh. Surely so striking a change would not have been made in a universal and perpetual law of God, without some warning. We ask for some hint of this modification of the fourth commandment. We find not a syllable.—We say thirdly, that the first Christians knew nothing of this substitution. Our evidence here is complete. The first converts to Christianity were Jews, and these converts

had at first no conception of the design of Christianity to supersede the law of Moses. This law they continued to observe for years, and to observe it as rigorously as ever. When Paul visited Jerusalem, after many labors among the Gentiles, the elders 'said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and they are all zealous of the law.'\* Of course they all observed the Jewish sabbath, or seventh day of rest, the greatest of Jewish festivals, whilst, as we all believe, they honored also the first day, the remembrancer of Christ's resurrection. This state of things existed for years in the primitive church. The two days were observed together. Nothing more seems necessary to disprove unanswerably the common doctrine, that the apostles enjoined the substitution of the first for the seventh day.—We will add one more argument. Paul commands the Colossian Christians to disregard the censures of those who judged or condemned them for not observing the sabbath. 'Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days.'† This passage is very plain. It is evaded, however, by the plea, that the word 'sabbath,' was used to express not only the seventh day, but other festivals or days of rest. But when we recollect that the word is used by Paul in this place without any exception or limitation, and that it was employed at that time, most frequently and almost wholly, to express the seventh day, or weekly sabbath, we shall see, that we have the strongest reason for supposing this institution to be intended by the apostle. That a Christian, after reading this passage, should 'judge,' or condemn his brethren, for questioning or rejecting his particular notion of the sabbath, is a striking proof of the slow progress of tolerant and liberal principles among men. We need not add, after these remarks, how unjustifiable we deem it to enforce particular modes of observing this day, by an array of Associations.

Having thus stated what seem to us strong reasons against the perpetuity of the ancient sabbath, perhaps some of our readers may wish to know our views of the Lord's-day, and although the subject may seem foreign to the present article, we will give our opinion in a few words. We believe, that the first day of the week is to be set apart for the public worship of God, and for the promotion of the knowledge and practice of Chris-

\* Acts, xxi. 20.

† Col. ii. 16.

tianity, and that it was selected for this end in honor of the resurrection of Christ. To this view we are led by the following considerations. Wherever the gospel was preached, its professors were formed into churches or congregations, and ministers were appointed for their instruction or edification. Wherever Christianity was planted, societies for joint religious acts and improvement were instituted, as the chief means of establishing and diffusing it. Now it is plain, that for these purposes regular times must have been prescribed, and accordingly we find that it was the custom of the primitive Christians to hold their religious assemblies on the first day of the week, the day of Christ's resurrection. \* This we learn from the New Testament, and from the universal testimony of the earliest ages of the church. Wherever Christianity was spread, the first day was established as the season of christian worship and instruction. Such are the grounds on which this institution rests. We regard it as altogether a *christian institution*; as having its origin in the gospel, as peculiar to the new dispensation; and we conceive that the proper observation of it is to be determined wholly by the spirit of Christianity. We meet in the New Testament no precise rules as to the mode of spending the Lord's-day, as to the mode of worship and teaching, as to the distribution of the time not given to public services. And this is just what might be expected; for the gospel is not a religion of precise rules. It differs from Judaism in nothing more than in its free character. It gives great principles, broad views, general, prolific, all-comprehensive precepts, and entrusts the application of them to the individual. It sets before us the perfection of our nature, the spirit which we should cherish, the virtues which constitute 'the kingdom of heaven within us,' and leaves us to determine for ourselves, in a great measure, the discipline by which these noble ends are to be secured. Let not man, then, bind what Christ has left free. The modes of worship and teaching on the Lord's-day are not prescribed, and who will say that they cannot be improved? One reason of the neglect and limited influence of this institution, is, that, as now observed, it does not correspond sufficiently to the wants of our times; and we fear that it might even fall into contempt among the cultivated, should attempts be prosecuted to carry it back to the superstitious rigor by which it was degraded in a former age.

The Associations for promoting the Observance of the Sab-



bath, propose several objects, in which, to a certain extent, we heartily concur, but which, from their nature, are not susceptible of precise definition or regulation, and which, therefore, ought to be left, where Christianity has left them, to the consciences of individuals. They undoubtedly intend to discountenance labor on Sunday. Now, generally speaking, abstinence from labor seems to us a plain duty of the day; for we see not how its ends can otherwise be accomplished to any considerable extent. We do not believe, indeed, that this abstinence was rigidly practised by the first Christians at Jerusalem, who, as we have seen, gave up the seventh day to entire rest, and whose social duties could hardly have admitted the same appropriation of the following day. Neither do we believe that the converts who were made among the class of slaves in heathen countries, abstained from labor on the first day of the week; for, in so doing, they would have exposed themselves to the severest punishments, even to death, and we have no intimation that this portion of believers were regularly cut off by martyrdom. We know, however, that the early Christians, in proportion as they were relieved from the restrictions of Heathenism and Judaism, made the Lord's-day a season of abstinence from labor; and the arguments for so doing are so obvious and strong, that later Christians have concurred with them with hardly a dissenting voice. On this point there is, and can be, no difference. The change of Sunday into a working day, we should condemn as earnestly as any of our brethren. At the same time, we feel, that in this particular a Jewish rigor is not to be imposed on Christians, and that there are exigences justifying toil on the first day, which must be left to individual judgment. The great purposes of this festival may certainly be accomplished without that scrupulous, anxious shunning of every kind of work, which marked a Jewish sabbath, and which, however proper under a servile dispensation and in an age of darkness, would in us be superstition. We do not, for example, think Christians bound to prepare on Saturday every meal for the following day, or to study through the week how to remove the necessity of every bodily exertion on the approaching Sunday. We think, too, that cases may occur, which justify severe toil on this day; and we should judge a man unfaithful to himself and his family, ungrateful to Providence, and superstitious, who should lose a crop rather than harvest it during the portion of time ordinarily set apart

for christian worship. On these points Christianity has left us free. The individual must be his own judge, and we deprecate the attempts of Societies to legislate, on this indefinite subject, for their fellow Christians.

Another purpose of the Associations of which we speak, is, to stop the mail on Sunday. On this point, a great difference of opinion prevails among the most conscientious men. It may be remembered, that, in a former number of this work, there was an article on the sabbath, discouraging this attempt to interrupt the mail. We think it right to say, that among the contributors to this work, and among its best friends, a diversity of sentiment exists in regard to this difficult question. In one respect, however, we all agree; and that is, in the inexpediency of organizing, in opposition to the Sunday mail, a vast Association, which may be easily perverted to political purposes, which, from its very object, will be tempted to meddle with government, and which, by setting up a concerted and joint cry, may overpower, and load with reproach, the most conscientious men in the community.

Another purpose of these Associations, is, to discourage travelling on the Lord's-day. Nothing can well be plainer, than that unnecessary travelling on this day is repugnant to its duties and design, and is to be reprov'd in writing, preaching, and conversation. By unnecessary travelling, we mean that which is not required by some particular exigency. When we consider, however, that in such a community as ours, distinguished by extent and variety of intercourse, exigences must continually occur, we feel, that here is another point with which Societies have no right to interfere, and which must be left to the conscience of the individual. In such a community as ours, how many persons may be found on every Sunday, the state of whose health, the state of whose families, the state of whose affairs, may require them to travel. It may happen, that another's property confided to our care may be lost, that a good object may fail, that some dying or departing friend may go from us unseen, if on this day we will not begin or pursue a journey. How often is it difficult for the traveller to find an inn, the quiet and comforts of which make it a fit residence for Sunday. An Association against travelling on Sunday, seems to us a very hazardous expedient, and its members, we think, will be fortunate if they escape the guilt of censoriousness and dictation, on a subject which Providence has plainly exempted

from human legislation. We know that it will be said, that the license which we give by these remarks, will be abused ; and of this we have no doubt. We know no truth, no privilege, no power, no blessing, no right, which is not abused. But is liberty to be denied to men, because they often turn it into licentiousness ? We have read of certain sects, which have denounced indiscriminately all sports and relaxations, because these, if allowed, will be carried to excess ; and of others, which have prescribed by laws the plainest, coarsest dress, because ornament, if in any measure tolerated, would certainly grow up into extravagance and vanity. And is this degrading legislation never to end ? Are men never to be trusted to themselves ? Is it God's method to hem them in with precise prescriptions ? Does Providence leave nothing to individual discretion ? Does Providence withhold every privilege which may be abused ? Does Christianity enjoin an exact, unvarying round of services, because reason and conscience, if allowed to judge of duty, will often be misguided by partiality and passion ? How liberal, generous, confiding, are nature, Providence, and Christianity, in their dealings with men ! And when will men learn to exercise towards one another the same liberal and confiding spirit ?

We have thus considered some of the particular purposes of the Associations for promoting the Observance of the Sabbath. We say, their 'particular purposes.' We apprehend there is a general one, which lurks in a portion of their members, which few perhaps have stated very distinctly to themselves, but which is not therefore the less real, and of which it is well to be forewarned. We apprehend that some, and not a small party, have a vague, instinctive feeling, that the kind of Christianity which they embrace, requires for its diffusion a gloomy sabbath, the Puritan sabbath ; and we incline to believe that they are desirous to separate the Lord's-day as much as possible from all other days, to make it a season of rigid restraint, that it may be a preparation for a system of theology, which the mind, in a natural, free, and cheerful state, can never receive. The sabbath of the Puritans and their Calvinistic peculiarities go together. Now we wish the return of neither. The Puritans, measured by their age, have indeed many claims on respect, especially those of them who came to this country, and who, through their fortunate exile, escaped the corruption, which the civil war, and the possession of power, engendered in the Puritan body of England. But sincere respect for the men of

early times, may be joined with a clear perception of their weaknesses and errors ; and it becomes us to remember, that errors, which in them were innocent, because inevitable, may deserve a harsher appellation if perpetuated in their posterity.

We have no desire, it will be seen, to create huge Associations for enforcing or recommending the Lord's-day. We desire, however, that this interesting subject may engage more attention. We wish the Lord's-day to be more honored and more observed ; and we believe that there is but one way for securing this good, and that is, to make the day more useful, to turn it to better account, to introduce such changes into it as shall satisfy judicious men, that it is adapted to great and happy results. The Sunday which has come down to us from our fathers seems to us exceedingly defective. The clergy have naturally taken it very much into their own hands, and, we apprehend, that as yet they have not discovered all the means of making it a blessing to mankind. It may well excite surprise, how little knowledge has been communicated on the Lord's-day. We think, that the present age admits and requires a more extensive teaching than formerly ; a teaching not only in sermons, but in more instructive exercises, which will promote a critical and growing acquaintance with the scriptures ; will unfold morality or duty, at once in its principles and vast details ; will guide the common mind to larger views, and to a more religious use of nature and history ; and will reveal to it its own godlike powers. We think, too, that this great intellectual activity may be relieved and cheered by a mixture of greater benevolent activity ; by attention to public and private charities, and by domestic and social kindnesses.\* It seems to us that we are waking up to understand the various uses to which Sunday may be applied. The present devotion of a considerable portion of it to the teaching of children, makes an important era in the history of the institution. The teaching of the ignorant and poor, we trust, is to follow. On this subject we cannot enlarge, but enough has been said to show in what way Sunday is to be recommended to the understandings and consciences of men.

In these remarks we have expressed our reverence for the Lord's-day. To us it is a more important day, and conse-

\* Would not the business of our public charities be done more effectually on the Lord's-day than on any other, and would not such an appropriation of a part of this time accord peculiarly with the spirit of Christianity ?



crated to nobler purposes, than the ancient sabbath. We are bound, however, to state, that we cannot acquiesce in the distinctions which are often made between this and other days, for they seem to us at once ungrounded and pernicious. We sometimes hear, for example, that the Lord's-day is set apart from our common lives to religion. What! Are not all days equally set apart to religion? Has religion more to do with Sunday than with any other portion of time? Is there any season, over which piety should not preside?—So the day is sometimes distinguished as 'holy.' What! Is there stronger obligation to holiness on one day than on another? Is it more holy to pray in the church than to pray in the closet, or than to withstand temptation in common life? The true distinction of Sunday is, that it is consecrated to certain means or direct acts of religion. But these are not holier than other duties. They are certainly not more important than their end, which is a virtuous life. There is, we fear, a superstition on this point, unworthy of the illumination of Christianity. We earnestly recommend the Lord's-day, but we dare not esteem its duties above those of other days. We prize and recommend it as an institution through which our whole lives are to be sanctified and ennobled; and without this fruit, vain, and worse than vain, are the most rigid observances, the most costly sacrifices, the loudest and most earnest prayers. We would on no account disparage the offices of the Lord's-day. We delight in this peaceful season, so fitted to allay the feverish heat and anxieties of active life, to cherish self-communion and communion with God and with the world to come. It is good to meet as brethren in the church, to pray together, to hear the word of God, to retire for a time from ordinary labors, that we may meditate on great truths more deliberately, and with more continuous attention. In these duties we see a fitness, excellence, and happiness; but still, if a comparison must be made, they seem to us less striking proofs of piety and virtue, than are found in the disinterestedness, the self-control, the love of truth, the scorn of ill-gotten wealth, the unshaken trust in God, the temperate and grateful enjoyment, the calm and courageous sufferings for duty, to which the Christian is called in daily life. It is right to adore God's goodness in the hour of prayer; but does it not seem more excellent to carry in our souls the conviction of this goodness, as our spring and pattern, and to breathe it forth in

acts conformed to the beneficence of our Maker? It is good to seek strength from God in the church ; but does it not seem more excellent to use well this strength in the sore conflicts of life, and to rise through it to a magnanimous and victorious virtue? Such comparisons, however, we have no pleasure in making, and they are obviously exposed to error. The enlightened Christian 'esteemeth every day alike.' To him all days bring noble duties ; bring occasions of a celestial piety and virtue ; bring trials, in wrestling with which he may grow strong ; bring aids and incitements, through which he may rise above himself. All days may be holy, and the holiest is that in which he yields himself, with the most single-hearted, unshrinking, uncompromising purpose, to the will of God.

We intended to add remarks on some other Associations, particularly on the Peace Society. But we have exceeded our limits, and must forbear. Our remarks have been free, but, we trust, will not be misunderstood. We look with interest and hope on the spirit of association, which characterizes our times. We rejoice in this, as in every manifestation of a desire for the improvement of mankind. We have done what we could to secure this powerful instrument against perversion. Through a wise and jealous care, we doubt not that it will minister to that only sure good, the intellectual and moral progress of the human race.

---

